



AN ABC OF PSYCHOLOGY

AN ABC *of* PSYCHOLOGY

FOR SUNDAY-SCHOOL TEACHERS
AND BIBLE STUDENTS

BY

ERIC S. WATERHOUSE,
D.D., M.A.

Professor of Psychology and Philosophy at
Richmond College, Surrey, Divinity School
of the University of London.

LONDON
THE EPWORTH PRESS
J. ALFRED SHARP

First Edition - - - June 1927
Second Edition February 1929

MADE AND PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN.

TO THE MEMORY OF
PROFESSOR WILLIAM JAMES
OF HARVARD,
TEACHER OF TEACHERS.

CONTENTS

CHAP.		PAGE
I.	PSYCHOLOGY AND THE TEACHER - -	II
II.	THE SCOPE AND METHODS OF PSYCHOLOGY	17
III.	INSTINCT AND INHERITANCE - - -	24
IV.	EMOTIONS, SENTIMENTS, AND COMPLEXES -	34
V.	IMITATION AND SUGGESTION - - -	41
VI.	REACTIONS AND THEIR PLACE IN TEACHING	48
VII.	HABIT AND ITS LAWS - - - -	55
VIII.	INTEREST AND ATTENTION - - - -	62
IX.	ASSOCIATION AND MEMORY - - -	66
X.	APPERCEPTION: OR HOW THE MIND RE- CEIVES IMPRESSIONS - - - -	71
XI.	IMAGINATION AND DAY DREAMING - -	77
XII.	BELIEF AND UNBELIEF - - - -	85
XIII.	INTELLIGENCE, REASON, AND RATIONAL- IZING - - - - -	91
XIV.	WILL: OR THE SELF IN ACTION - -	98
XV.	INDIVIDUALITY, SELFHOOD, AND PERSON- ALITY - - - - -	103
XVI.	JESUS AS A TEACHER - - - -	114

FOREWORD

THIS is not a text book of psychology. Its purpose is to help the Sunday-school teacher, who has had no chance of studying the subject, to know a little about some psychological facts and their application to teaching. Hence simplicity must be put before completeness. It is almost impossible to be at once sufficiently simple and absolutely accurate. I hope, however, I have not erred seriously, and that the expert who may open the book will not forget its purpose. For this reason I have omitted references and controversial matter, such as the theories of Behaviourism, and have limited myself to well-accepted views, not even venturing to introduce the very interesting conclusions of the 'Gestalt' school, nor the more controversial points of psycho-analytic teaching, though I have made use of such part of it as seems best attested.

These chapters originally appeared in *The Methodist Times*, and by the courtesy of the editor have been reprinted with certain corrections and additions. They were intended to be accompanied by the use of James's *Talks to Teachers on Psychology*, and to supplement the splendid material that book still affords with something of the teaching that has developed since it was written. This and the fact that my own introduction to psychology was due to the writings of Professor James, explains my particular indebtedness to him. Amongst others I must name the work of Professor Stout, James Ward, and W. McDougall. All recent psychology, whether psycho-analytic or not, has moreover to acknowledge the work of Freud

and Jung. The purpose of this little book is preliminary merely, to 'allure to brighter worlds and lead the way.' The 'brighter worlds' are the writings mentioned and the many excellent and more complete books on educational psychology.

In the last chapter I try to give a sketch of the teaching methods of Jesus, partly for its own interest and still more as a model of the teacher's art. The method is so perfectly subordinate to the message that many do not notice it. Yet it remains as a wonderful illustration of what the art of teaching should be; and the Sunday-school teacher is indeed fortunate in the fact that the book he teaches shows him both what and how to teach.

E. S. WATERHOUSE.

Richmond College,
June, 1927.

AN A B C OF PSYCHOLOGY

CHAPTER I

PSYCHOLOGY AND THE TEACHER

Psychology: A Science

WE hear a great deal about psychology nowadays, and some teachers, imagining that psychology is going to teach them new and wonderful things, are disappointed when they begin to read it. 'This is nothing very special,' they complain; 'I knew most of it beforehand.' Let us not be too hasty, however. Psychology is a science, but science is only exactified common sense. I do not think that 'exactify' is a dictionary word, but it is expressive. Not technical terms, but accuracy, mark a science. Teaching is an art. The science gives the laws, but the art applies them. The theory of music does not necessarily help the one who knows it to be a good player, nor does mere knowledge of anatomy make a skilful surgeon. The science and the art must meet in a mind that knows the one and can direct it upon the other. Teaching, if it is to be good, must be in harmony

with psychology, but just book knowledge of psychology never yet made a good teacher. Many of the old school of common-sense teachers were splendid, and they had never even heard of psychology. Why, then, trouble about psychology? Shall we put it this way? If a motor breaks down, a village blacksmith with no knowledge of motors might, by sheer shrewdness—shall we say, horse-sense?—hit on the way to repair it. But we prefer, though it doesn't follow the ordinary garage can supply, a skilful motor mechanic. Similarly, good though the old teachers often were, the new teacher, with the science of psychology to help, should be better, and it is without question that the teaching of to-day as a whole is vastly superior to that of previous times. A knowledge of psychology is not going to make a duffer a good teacher, nor is its lack going to make a born teacher ineffective; but psychology can do something. Let us see what. Positively it can—

- (1) Reinforce practice by soundly based theory.
- (2) Introduce fresh standpoints in and interest into teaching.
- (3) Make teaching definite and methodical.

Negatively it can—

- (4) Prevent errors, waste of time, fruitless experiments, etc.

The Standpoint of Modern Educational Psychology

From Aristotle to the nineteenth century man was looked upon as the reasoning animal; and, after all, human reason is the most wonderful fact of nature. But to think that it is always the dominating feature of the mind is a mistake. A

young child has very little reasoning powers. His mind is made for activity, and the purpose of education is not so much to instil knowledge as to direct and co-ordinate the child's activities, his instincts and impulses, so as to teach him how to use them rightly in after life. Moreover, we know that what are called the 'concept centres' of the brain, the part connected with reasoning powers, do not develop till the child is well grown. Teaching, therefore, begins by helping the child first to observe, then to do ; it gives object and manual lessons before asking him to think much. The older methods of teaching failed to see this. G. B. Shaw once said that his education was greatly interrupted by his school days! We smile, but it may well have been true. Education, said William James, is 'the organization of acquired habits of conduct and tendencies to behaviour.' In other words we want to teach children how to live, not what to know. If the teacher will but think for a moment of his own school lessons, he will realize how much of them has been quite forgotten. If what they were meant to do was to instil knowledge, it was a wasteful process. But if school training helped to equip for all life's emergencies it proved its value. Similarly the work of the Sunday-school teacher is not measured by the accuracy with which the class may repeat Bible stories. It lies in the moral and religious outlook which the child gathers, and no child ever loses in after life the influence of the Sunday School. This is not a pious hope, it is a psychological fact. Unfortunately, there are other and adverse influences which may prove dominant in after life, but it is true that they will always be subject to some modification by the good influences of childhood. 'There never was one lost good' is the great encouragement of every teacher.

The Supremacy of Behaviour

The supremacy of activity or behaviour is often only too well known in practice by the harassed teacher who complains that the behaviour he has to deal with is bad behaviour. Yet bad behaviour is sometimes more promising a sign than good! It often means nothing worse than strong tendencies to activity, whilst some good behaviour is simply due to mental and physical weakness: the poor child is too listless to be naughty. If we can succeed in harnessing restlessness to something practical, in setting the mischievous mind to chase something useful, our bad boys and girls may prove our most promising scholars. The material is there, anyhow. Their very bad behaviour shows that. Remember, then, to teach not just to instil knowledge but to prepare for action, not so much to know, but to know how to do.

Religious Education

School is so happy an affair nowadays that Shakespeare's commentators will soon have to write a note to explain to a puzzled generation why the bard wrote so strange a conceit as:

The whining schoolboy, with his satchel
And shining morning face, creeping like snail
Unwillingly to school.

But people still think religious education is uncongenial. Yet the human race is religious, and always has been. From time immemorial and now there has not been any known race of men with no religious beliefs and practices. As an ordinary member of the human race, the child is normally interested in religion, and the idea that he is not is false. But why does it arise? Because we hear people

who say they were 'sickened with religion' when they were children. If this is true—it is not always—it is because unwise adults gave them adult religion. One does not hear that the professional cricketer's son was sickened of cricket, or the artist's son of art, or even the schoolmaster's son of books. Give a child religious teaching in a way that appeals to him, bring the light and winsomeness of Christianity into it, and it will not find him unresponsive. If religion is a matter of taboos, a list of prohibitions, one can understand the child's revolt. Another bad method is to hold up God as a sort of magistrate enforcing moral law. There has been too much of this kind of teaching in the past, and hence some of the results we deplore.

Again, what interests the child's parents will tend to interest him. Imitation is an inborn tendency, and children imitate without learning to do so, or knowing that they do. Hence the old saw about example and precept; hence, too, the folly of thinking that parent or teacher can make the child keen when they are not. The advantage of teachers in a day school, teaching subjects rather than classes is not because the specialist knows more about the subject he concentrates upon. A much more elementary knowledge would suffice for the type of teaching required. It is because he is keen on that subject, and no one can be keen on all subjects. The analogy with religious teaching is perfect. A further point remains. The Sunday-school teacher is necessarily at a disadvantage compared with the day-school teacher. But in one respect he has the advantage. The smaller classes give him a chance for closer individual work. There are native differences in children which persist despite the influence of environment. Any family shows us that, even when home training is exactly the same for all, all do not react to it in the same way.

There will always be a similar difference in Sunday School. But there are few children indeed who do not respond to interest, sympathy, and affection. The child's attitude to religion in later life will be far more influenced by the personal character and interest of the teacher than even by what he has learnt of the Bible.

CHAPTER II

THE SCOPE AND METHODS OF PSYCHOLOGY

A Definition of Psychology

WE may define psychology as the science of behaviour studied as a manifestation of mental processes. We mean by behaviour, not conduct in the moral sense, but all activity. If we see a child crying, we assume he is unhappy. Unhappiness is a mental state, but all our conclusions about the child's unhappiness are drawn from his behaviour, and if he tells us why he is crying, his speech is behaviour in this sense. We cannot tell anything of the mental state of a sleeping child, because there is no outward behaviour to interpret. If, however, the child cries or tosses about in sleep, we perhaps assume he is dreaming. Possibly some are surprised that we have not defined psychology as the science of the soul. But what is the soul? Psychology is a descriptive science, and a descriptive science tells something of the laws under which its subject is manifest, but does not need to discuss its ultimate character. For example, physics need not begin by stating what 'matter' may be. Similarly, whatever is meant by 'soul,' the soul works under definite conditions, and the task of psychology is to ascertain what these are, not to speculate what the soul may be. Similarly, too, with the terms 'mind' and

'consciousness.' It is no explanation of memory, for example, to call it one of the mind's faculties. Psychology is interested in the manifestation of the mind in action, speech, thought—not in mind abstractly. All psychology need assume, then, is a subject who thinks, feels, wills, acts; for, after all, every thought is some individual's thought, and we must not be led to imagine thoughts existing without thinkers.

The Methods of Psychology

In the old days psychology was called 'mental philosophy,' but it has now gained recognition as a science, and its method in general is that of science, which is, first, observation and description of the facts; then the building up of hypotheses, which, if well verified, become 'theories' or 'laws,' to explain them; and, lastly, the application of these general laws to particular cases. The psychologist may, of course, observe the behaviour of others, or he may engage in self-observation or 'introspection.' It may seem easy to watch the working of one's own mind, but it is not so simple as it seems.

There are several points to remember, which we will enumerate. (1) The mind cannot work and attend to its own working at the same time. In a certain sense, all thought is after-thought, and all introspection retrospection. For when we think of our thoughts, they have already passed and gone. As Bergson graphically puts it, all we can do is to conduct a post-mortem on them. Nor can we catch them again exactly as they were. There is a peculiar intensity about any actual experience as a living whole at the moment we experience it which cannot be repeated. Think of a thrill of joy or stab of sharp pain. You can never get the

THE SCOPE AND METHODS OF PSYCHOLOGY 19

original intensity in the recall. (2) Our states of mind begin to fade the moment they have passed. We may recall them with substantial accuracy, but the chances are that something has gone. It is never a hundred-per-cent. recall. (3) Description of thoughts and feelings has to be given in words which are seldom well fitted to them. Bergson says that language is 'the language of solids.' He means that mankind first invented names for material things, and extended them to spiritual things—for example, 'subject,' 'impression,' 'spirit,' and many other terms originally had, and still have, material as well as psychological meanings. We find ourselves thinking in terms of matter and space, for though we know it is inaccurate, we imagine our thoughts as 'in' our brain, and our soul as 'in' our body. We use metaphors. They help, but they often mislead. (4) We are apt to go astray by imagining that others' experience must be like our own. The musical man simply cannot understand that some people can actually be entirely unmoved by music. Then we think that others must be aware of their own states of mind as we are. We see a man behaving foolishly, for example, and, knowing he has been drinking, imagine he must know that is the cause of his folly. If we try to save him from the results of his stupidity, the chances are that, so far from appreciating our action, he will blame us for making him act as he does! These things may seem obvious, but the teacher often makes the mistake of thinking that what is clear to him must be clear to the class, or that the class must see its mistakes as he sees them. This is precisely the same error as we have just been explaining. The psychology a teacher needs is not difficult to acquire, but he must clearly bear in mind the cautions we have been mentioning.

Conscious, Sub-Conscious, and Unconscious

We have seen something of the nature and methods of psychology, or at least of the sort of psychology we are to study, for psychology is a term as wide as mathematics and covers many branches, some of which lie wholly outside our scope here. Our next step will be to distinguish within our mind as a whole three aspects, not separate, and indeed never wholly separable, but treated separately by psychological analysis, just as any analysis of a living whole must separate for its purposes what are never found apart. Think of a searchlight swinging to and fro. Objects are focussed in the beam, whilst round it are other objects dimly shown and fading away to utter darkness. As the searchlight moves, some of these come under its beam, and others pass out of it. Sometimes an object moves itself into the light and is revealed by it. We will call the searchlight the focus of consciousness. That is to say, the object on which the searchlight is fixed is the thought or state of mind to which we are directly attending at the moment. In the margin is the subconscious, that is to say, it is the region round about the beam, but not directly lit up by it. The operator we may call the will. As will directs, consciousness moves its focus, now bringing something from the subconscious into the full beam, whilst what was being attended to a moment before sinks into the margin. Sometimes what was in the subconscious seems to thrust itself forward into consciousness, as when a missing name is suddenly recollected. Indeed, the subconscious mind oftens acts as a faithful 'secretary,' carrying all sorts of facts and supplying them to us at need. We all know that when conscious attention is being focussed on any object, other impressions are neglected, yet they are not unnoticed wholly. We may not be aware of the

clock's tick as we write, but if the clock stop we notice it, which shows that the ticking was subconsciously in our mind. Only a very small part of the impressions registered by our senses are at any moment immediately before attention. The rest are subconsciously received.

The 'unconscious' is sometimes used in the same sense as the 'subconscious,' but this is not to be recommended. It is best reserved for the remotest and darkest region of the mind that cannot be recalled into consciousness by normal means. That such a sphere exists we cannot doubt; for one thing people under hypnotism will sometimes recall experiences which no effort of normal memory can bring back. Moreover, those who deal with nervous disorders have shown abundantly that in many cases the roots run back into unconscious experience which the patient cannot ordinarily recall. It is necessary in our study of psychology to distinguish these three aspects of mind, but in doing so we must not forget that they are not separate compartments, but aspects of mind which is by its nature a unity.

Feeling, Will, and Thought

Our minds then have three aspects—the conscious, subconscious, and unconscious—so that mind is a much more complex thing than ordinary consciousness itself. The place and importance of the subconscious and unconscious will be clear in our later studies, but both are very big factors in life, both children's lives and those of us all. Now we shall take a further step in our analysis of mind, for just as mind itself has three aspects, so every state of mind has also certain aspects which may be classed as a trio, too, will, feeling, and thought. I shall use these terms for simplicity's sake, but I prefer the more exact and technical words, 'conation,' 'affect,' and 'cognition.'

Every state of mind, or mental process, involves all three, though not necessarily all three equally. As I write I glance out of the window and see a tree. That is the object of my thought for the moment; it is, that is to say, a cognition. But as the tree is graceful and its fresh green restful to my eyes, as the sun glints behind it, the sight is pleasant to me. That is the feeling element, or affect. Since it is pleasant, I find myself inclined to let my gaze linger upon it. That is the element of will, or conation—the will to retain the pleasing and reject the displeasing. If you try a similar analysis you will find the same three aspects, feeling, will, and thought in every state of mind. Sometimes, as in a moment of great joy or agony, the feeling element monopolizes consciousness; sometimes as in ‘a brown study,’ the element of thought is strongest, but all are present always. It may often seem that some states of mind are neutral, neither pleasant nor unpleasant. Possibly we cannot discriminate sufficiently finely in these instances and so they appear neutral. A finer analysis would probably show us that some feeling, or affect, pleasant or unpleasant, is there all the same, however faint.

The Cinematograph of Consciousness

Our analysis of mind and of mental processes into various aspects must not betray us into thinking that states of mind follow one another, each independent and complete like magic-lantern slides. A much better illustration would be the cinematograph film, which is continuous yet always changing. From birth to death the reel of our consciousness runs on unbroken, and Christians, at any rate, believe that death does not cut off the reel and end the drama played within our minds. The practical importance, however, of recognizing within the unity of our conscious-

ness the elements of feeling, will, and thought, is that as teachers, if we are to capture the minds of our children, we must capture all three. Our business is not merely to instil knowledge or train thought. The great domain of will or desire has an even greater influence upon character, and the disciplining and purifying of feeling is not less urgent.

CHAPTER III

INSTINCT AND INHERITANCE

What is instinct?

WE have been discussing preliminary topics chiefly in our previous chapters. Now to begin our study of human behaviour, and especially that of children. Underlying all our actions are the great elemental instincts, which are just as powerful in us as in the animals. Only beware a moment before we plunge into talk about instinct. It is not only a much misused word, many things that are not instinctive being put down to instinct, but it is also a word that tells us little. We say 'This is done by instinct,' but if we said it is done by X, it would amount to as much, for instinct, like X, is an unknown quantity. That is to say we explain nothing by calling it instinctive. Still it is useful to denote as instinctive certain forms of behaviour which fulfil these four conditions. First, they are common to a whole species of creatures; second, they are directed towards some end necessary to its function in life; thirdly, such ends are not necessarily foreseen; and, lastly, such forms of behaviour are not incapable, in certain cases, of alteration, suspension, or improvement. These are, then, the marks of instinctive activities. It follows that what is not inborn but learnt, and what is peculiar to individuals falls outside the proper use of the word.

Next, we will name the chief instincts of man. Fighting,

flight, repulsion, submission, and assertion are chiefly connected with our struggle in life. Those of the mate and parent, with love. Those of acquisition, construction, food-seeking, and curiosity, with the tasks we have to fulfil. Those of the group and of appeal (the tendency to call for help), with our relations with others. Dr. McDougall, whose list we have adopted, thinks that each instinct has its own particular emotion—anger goes with fighting, fear with flight, and so on. This is so in many cases, but perhaps not in all. Besides these instincts, he recognizes certain other forms of inborn tendency—sympathy, suggestibility, imitation, play, habit-forming, and temperament. Now, every human being has all these instincts, but not all in equal proportion. In some cases one or more are much more marked than others. Yet somewhere in our nature is a place for each, and a rightful place. No instinct is bad or meant to lead to anything bad. The Creator gave each its duty to fulfil. But where the animal can follow its instincts in one way only, we can follow them in two—a right and a wrong. The instincts are the teacher's material. Think how the instincts of curiosity, construction, and acquisition, to name two or three, can be linked up with our attempts to teach. Whatever touches one of the instincts is interesting. To know the instincts, therefore, is to know where the springs of interest lie. Moreover, to know the instincts is to know the unchanging elements of human nature. Modern man lives in large cities, goes by thousands to sports and race meetings, forms political clubs, and so forth. None of these things must necessarily remain. It might be that all large cities were destroyed, sports dropped out, and politics were abandoned because a dictator assumed all power. Yet the social, acquisitive, and other instincts that express themselves in

these forms in modern life would abide and take fresh forms, for instinct is permanent. The importance of this to the teacher we will consider a little further.

Instinct and Training

The instincts then underlie all our activities. They are unchanging and timeless. Their manifestations change. That is just the point to remember. We cannot eradicate instinct, but we can do a great deal as regards its expression both by finding the right and checking the wrong. Instinctive activities can never be stopped any more than can a stream be checked permanently by a dam. But the stream can be turned into a new channel, and so with instincts. They can be 'sublimated' or switched off into other directions, though they will still keep their original character and 'urge' or driving force. The teacher must find the right channel. To repress any instinct entirely is dangerous, mentally and morally. Instincts may lie dormant, but it is doubtful if ever they can be wholly lost. They are apt to wake to life again. Therefore, if we think we have repressed them, probably we are wrong.

Sublimation is better than repression, that is to say, turning the instinctive urge or drive into morally and socially useful forms. Take a few examples. Rivalry is an instinctive activity, and it cannot be wholly eliminated. The fact that an animal—say, a horse—will run faster when it is 'paced' suggests that the maximum of effort cannot be produced apart from rivalry. But even with animals, rivalry is not always of the tooth and claw type. Witness how keenly and happily dogs will play at fighting and do no harm. Much less, then, need we think that the instinct of rivalry need bring out the worst qualities in boys and girls. Competition of side, team or class together

against another group is better than individual rivalry, for the tempering element of loyalty enters. Or, again, it is possible to compete against oneself and one's own records. When we speak of a 'sporting' spirit in the true sense, we speak of a fine, and truly Christian, quality. The pity is that a 'sporting man' often means someone who wants to get money by gambling. To train a child to be a 'sport' is to perfect the fighting and group instincts.

Or think how the constructive instinct and that of curiosity are the ground upon which the Primary teacher begins. The group instincts include the tendency to accept leadership, and what has been called 'commonship'—that is, equal comradeship in the group. Curiously enough, there are unsociable children, yet they have the group instincts none the less, and these can be used to get them away from unsociableness, which usually is the result of shyness. Goldsmith has it :

Instinct is a surer guide
Than reason, boasting mortals' pride,

and he is right. The instincts are systems stored with emotional energy, and have a greater influence on character, particularly on undeveloped character, than passionless reason.

The Group Instincts

That children together and a child alone are very different propositions, everyone knows. Whilst a group is the aggregate of its individuals, the child in the group will share in ends and emotions and ideals which never possess him as an individual. As with every human being, the group instincts are at work in him, and the special characteristics of the group mind will show themselves even in small

children. Let us call a number of children running and shouting aimlessly as they dash out of school, a *concourse*. Each is going his or her own way, and there is no common interest. Then perhaps a motor fire-engine dashes up and the firemen rush into a house opposite the school. At once the concourse becomes a *crowd*, because a common interest and emotions unite them. A crowd, then, is a temporary unorganized gathering, and we may use the word group to denote the more permanent and organized associations.

Having distinguished our terms thus, we may now speak of the characteristics of the crowd and show how far the group shares them. They are—

(1) Increase of Emotion.—This is specially shown in such primitive emotional states as anger, panic, sympathy, and also in humour, approval, disapproval. The attraction of the crowd is not a little to be found in the chance it offers for expressing instinctive and emotional tendencies. In the group this characteristic is normally less strong, but a group may exhibit all the crowd emotions in moments of excitement.

(2) Increase of Suggestibility.—Common ideas, and sometimes illusions, accompany the crowd's emotions and are readily believed. A crowd has a great sense of its own powers, each relying on the rest, and a crowd of children may defy discipline, whilst each individual would promptly respond to an order. The suggestibility of the group takes the form of influence from tradition, custom, and the general opinion of the others, a feature strongly marked in Scouts, Guides, and Clubs.

(3) Decrease of Responsibility.—The responsibility each might feel personally is passed on to the rest. The sense of being unnoticed in the crowd lessens it considerably, and a crowd will do what none of its members would do

alone. Sometimes this is true of the group, but here *esprit de corps* enters, and the group may feel responsible for its laws and traditions.

(4) Decrease of Intelligence.—In proportion as the former factors are strong, intelligence is weak, because each child in the crowd thinks less for himself and imitates the rest. Then, too, the ideas and emotions that possess the crowd are apt strongly to colour all factors of the situation and prevent them from being seen from a reasonable standpoint. In the group it is possible to avoid this by giving the members some individual initiative, but sometimes group traditions and discipline limit the members' power of thinking for themselves.

A crowd then shows us the more primitive side of the mind's workings, and we must not judge children's actions in a crowd as we should judge what they deliberately do by themselves. A big crowd of children gathered at an anniversary or entertainment offer the speaker special opportunities because of the increased feeling and receptiveness of each in the mass. But crowd impressions are as passing as the crowd itself, an extra spurt that can be obtained but not maintained, and that is why the group is much better ground for teaching than the crowd. The group, we have seen, has the crowd characteristics, but in modified form. It represents something more permanent and organized than the crowd. The group needs three things: (1) First, some continuity of form or purpose to mark it out and keep it distinct; (2) second, an object definitely shared by its members, some common end, pleasure, or task; (3) thirdly, it must make some progress towards its end. A group that does nothing, just aimlessly drifting on, is bound sooner or later, probably sooner, to break up.

As practical suggestions we may add that most groups are better for (1) A heritage of tradition, which stimulates *esprit de corps*. We talk about Public School traditions, but I have known Sunday Schools, especially in the North, where the tradition is almost as keen. (2) Friendly rivalry or competition with other groups, such as shield contests, matches, and so forth. (3) Breaking up the duties amongst the members, so as to allow individual interest, and the sense of being personally needed and concerned, and yet enough team work to keep the spirit of loyalty well to the fore.

The importance of the group is that it means fellowship, and that is essential for character, work, and worship. 'You cannot be a whole unless you join a whole,' said Goethe. The Sunday-school class is a group, but it is not sufficient to bring out more than a small part of the group possibilities. Hence Boys' and Girls' Clubs, Scouts, Guides and the like are an essential part of religious teaching.

The Place of Heredity

A further point remains to be noticed. Instinct forms the main *inheritance* that each child's mind receives from the race. We must beware, however, of accepting the popular explanation of everything, physical and mental alike, in which children resemble their parents, as due to 'heredity.' It is important to know how far this is and is not true. In the bodily sense it is certain that we are what the stock we come from has made us, and our ancestry may count for more than our parents. Yet even here there is much exaggeration, for example, concerning 'inherited' disease. It is probably an entire mistake to believe that, shall we say, consumption is inherited, though the chest formation that provides a favourable opportunity

for the germ may be inherited. When, however, we speak of mental inheritance, we are on much less certain ground. The common assumption that habits acquired during the lifetime of the parents, such as an interest in engineering, proficiency in languages, or any moral habit, are inherited is utterly unproved. It is certain, for example, on the contrary, that no child inherits the power to speak English, however long his ancestors have spoken it. Some scientists think that certain experiments suggest that in rare cases acquired habits have been inherited, but even if this were proved, it would be the exception to the rule.

It is well that teachers should be aware of this, in order to understand what a much more free hand he has than some imagine in shaping children's characters. We hear sometimes of a 'born criminal.' It is improbable that ever there was such. The inborn inheritance is much less important mentally than the social inheritance. On the mission-field you may see in a single generation age-long heathenism changed to genuine Christianity. It would be equally true, on the other hand, that an English child, brought up in China by native foster-parents, would grow up with an English mind and a Chinese outlook. The National Children's Home and Dr. Barnardo's Orphanage report that 90 per cent. of their children turn out well, and when one realizes where many of these children came from, the result is very significant. Professor Hoernlé has said that the difference between the mind of a black man and of a white man is social rather than intellectual, a fact which explains why the black man can so readily assimilate European habits and knowledge.

In short, then, there is no scientific warrant for the notion that children inherit what their parents acquired. What is inborn is rather the instincts, and these are much

the same in every human being. It is a hopeful thing that the previous generation has in the mental sphere so little hold upon the next, although, of course, imitation will hand down habits from one generation to another. Imitation is not inheritance, however, and imitation can be much more readily dealt with than can inborn tendencies.

The 'All or None' Principle

The teacher, then, can assume that the common instincts are his chief concern, and although children differ in temperament, there is no reason for the fatalistic idea that they will be, by inborn determination, what their parents were. What he may take for granted is that the normal child will show the usual instinctive tendencies, and that they will underlie all his actions. Instinct, however, may work in a somewhat blind manner at times, as when a panic-stricken crowd trample on each other at the exit, whilst the emergency door of the burning building is unnoticed. Instinct is apt to work on what has been called 'the all or none principle,' and this is illustrated in childish outbursts of fury, in unreasoning fear, mischievous curiosity, or callous selfishness. In a developed character such things would be serious defects. In children they are rather the 'all or none' working of untrained instincts, and wrong handling may be a bigger danger than that which it is thought to cure. Instinct being a form of impulse goes straight towards its goal. Man is more indecisive in action than animals, because his thinking checks his instinctive promptings. Children, like the animals, are apt to act without restraint. To cow an angry child, punish a frightened child, or snub a curious child are all bad methods. The teacher must patiently wait, and by his own calmness check the emotional force of the instinct, and then by

sympathy and suggestion turn the child's mind into another channel. Try to make him sympathize with the comrade he is angry with ; meet his fear with quiet confident suggestion, perhaps make him curious about the object he fears ; meet his curiosity with a frank talk, telling him the truth in such a way as is suited for a child's mind, and you will have conquered the instinct by ' sublimating ' it. Force is no remedy. It is the way of the idle teacher who prefers restraining to training

CHAPTER IV

EMOTIONS, SENTIMENTS, AND COMPLEXES

The Place of Emotion in Life

IN our last chapter we mentioned the connexion between instinct and emotion, saying that the main instincts each had their own characteristic emotion, as for example, the emotions of wonder, anger, fear that accompany the instincts of curiosity, pugnacity, and flight. We cannot discuss here the refinements of the analysis of emotion, how emotions blend in compound form, like awe, which is a mixture of fear, wonder, and self-abasement, or derived emotions such as joy, hope, anxiety which depend upon some desire or dread already at work in our minds. Rather must we look at the educational aspect of emotional life.

The older type of educator thought his business was to instil reason and expel the 'passions' or emotions. The modern teacher realizes that in emotion he has a great asset, and his aim is not to get rid of the child's emotional tendencies, for he recognizes that is alike impossible and undesirable. Therefore he attempts to co-ordinate them and attach them to the right ends.

Let us see a few ways in which this may be done. The passing of emotions leaves a trace behind it, and the accumulation of these traces crystallizes into sentiments. Sentiments might be called the sediments of emotion. Do not think therefore that a child's anger, sorrow, fright,

and so forth being 'soon over' leave no mark. The staple material of character is the sentiments. A child who is constantly bullied, for example, will experience fear, anger, loathing, and so forth, and the traces of these emotions will become the material of its character in later life.

Not all children will react in the same way. Some will be made timid, others suspicious or sullen. In almost every case, however, dominance by a stronger will leads the weaker person to deceit and cunning, which often defeat the strength of the strong, but always react unfavourably on the mental and moral life of the one who is driven to subterfuge. Parents and teachers blame children for being deceitful, but they should ask themselves whether they have made the children fly to deceit by their domination. Even well-meant efforts to force children to be good may have this disastrous result. Fear has a very small place in a rightly ordered training. It is the one emotion that is unmarked in the perfect manhood of the Master, and that should be an indication for us. One of the worst of sentiments, hatred, is always a blend of fear and anger. You cannot hate where you do not in some sense fear. Many people hated Germany during the war; few, if any, do so now, and the reason is that we no longer fear her. Similarly the attitude of Germans towards England has changed. Far more bitterness is expressed by them towards the French whom they still fear. The surest way to keep hatred out of the children's lives is to keep fear out. Is there then no place for fear at all? Only perhaps in the words of the psalm. 'There is forgiveness with Thee that Thou mayest be feared,' not the wrath of God but rather His mercy is to be feared. The fear of being unworthy of love. That is a noble fear, and the only type of fear for which there is place in a life that trusts God.

The Uses of Emotion

We may next point out the possibilities of emotion as material in character building. Emotional tendencies are inborn, and are so much raw material. Everything depends on how they are built into the character. Just as every instinct has its place, so every emotion has, but some need considerable transformation, as we said regarding fear. We may say the same of anger. A character altogether lacking in righteous indignation is not a perfect character.

There was a place for anger in the manhood of the Master. But, so to speak, most children have more tendency to anger than can be used up in righteous indignation. The remainder can be 'sublimated'—that is to say, turned into another channel, and become energy or force of character, for, after all, there is room for more decision and energy than the placid and lethargic temperament displays. The process of sublimation is of the greatest importance, because it is the only way in which the native emotional energy can be turned into useful channels.

Next, recollect that emotion was meant to issue in some definite action. It is dangerous to stir emotion and give it no outlet. That is one of the perils of 'the pictures.' Professor James once said that those who indulged their emotions without finding a practical outlet for them in the end became 'moral paralytics,' able to feel but not to act. We all know the people who are sweetly sympathetic, but never stir a finger to help. This is mischievous. They see something pitiful. It makes them feel uncomfortable, but instead of getting comfort by giving help, they indulge their sympathetic feelings cheaply by saying how sorry they are, and feel better for it, but leave the wrong unrighted

and the helpless unhelped. If they had passed by on the other side they would have felt unhappy and reproached.

What Complexes Are

The word 'complex' in psychology denotes a cluster or 'constellation' of sentiments. Now most objects that enter at all deeply into life gather a group of sentiments round them, our friends, our favourite holiday resort, our church. But 'complex' nowadays is usually employed in the sense Jung gives to it, 'a system which has become or tends to become separated from the rest of the mental structure or personality, and by its domination of the mind has destroyed, or tends to destroy, the unity which is essential to mental health.'

It should be added that many complexes are repressed, and so driven into the background of mind, where those who possess them fail to recognize their existence, or persuade themselves of their non-existence. All sorts of reasons may be given to persuade oneself that the complex is not there, and in time, one can actually and honestly disbelieve it, even forget it, and it becomes lost in 'the unconscious.' It is curious to recognize that it is possible for our mind to be dominated by a factor of which we are unaware, but it not infrequently happens.

Take, for example, the child with an 'inferiority complex.' Here is a weakly lad with a curious lisp. He becomes the butt of his rougher schoolmates, and he grows sensitive about it. He does not like to acknowledge it to himself even, much less to others. The complex, the morbid sense of inferiority, dominates him none the less. An inferiority complex is generally accompanied by a compensating superiority complex. The lad imagines himself doing things to astonish those who laugh at him.

In one case known to me, such a lad broke into a shop and stole some sweets. He had no moral taint, but he had a mental 'kink' upon the subject of his inferiority, and his theft was an attempt to impress those who laughed at him with his dare-devil bravery. Such a child needs psychological treatment, not a reformatory.

Similarly there are many children with fear complexes. I knew a small boy who was terrified of cows, and still more terrified to acknowledge he was. His mother sent him on an errand across a field where cows grazed, and he flatly refused to go. As he would give no reason, but stubbornly declined, he was punished. No punishment had any effect, and his action was put down to wilful disobedience. As a matter of fact, it was due simply and solely to a fear complex that he would not admit, that perhaps he himself did not even recognize.

The Cure of a Complex

No teacher should jump hastily to conclusions about actions of this type without trying to find out whether some complex or other is not behind them. Remember that complexes are not rational, they are emotional, and the intensity of their emotional accompaniments can be understood somewhat if the teacher recognizes that he or she has similarly strong and irrational antipathies, perhaps to such harmless creatures as slugs or grass-snakes or mice, or to such figments of imagination as ghosts. The cure for a complex is not punishment, but sympathy and suggestion. Sympathetically, and without the slightest sign of blaming, or even investigating, try to find out whether there are any signs of a complex.

Then if you succeed in finding out what the complex is, use the indirect method of suggestion to try to remove it.

If it is an inferiority complex, for example, find something which the child can do, and praise that. In a London elementary school, there was a girl so backward that it was proposed to send her to a school for 'deficients.' She could not learn, and simply burst into tears when pressed or upbraided. The head master found that she could play the violin, and tactfully persuaded her to accompany the piano when the hymn at opening of school was sung. After a while, he persuaded her to play a violin solo to the school, and passed the word round that she should have an encore. Nothing loath, the youngsters applauded enthusiastically, and the teachers spoke a word of praise. The timid child found, to her astonishment, that she could do something others thought clever; from that day she began to learn, and though never attaining a normal standard for her age, left school with at least the elements of an education.

Minor Complexes

The teacher should remember that there are also what one might almost call commonplace complexes, as well as these strongly marked and somewhat exceptional ones. Everyone has known in children, attitudes which seem to grown up folk unreasonable, sometimes inexplicable; sorrows over trifles, fears 'about nothing,' and sometimes we are inclined to become impatient, and impatience is almost always the forecourt of injustice. Probably there is a mild complex behind all these particular attitudes. Such a complex needs treatment not punishment. Naturally, no sensible teacher talks to the child concerned about complexes, but he tries, none the less, to unearth it. It will be recollected that a complex's characteristic is that it is a cluster of sentiments that become detached from

the system of consciousness and form a little system of their own. The cure is to break down their isolation, and bring them into touch with the rest. A single example must serve. A small child showed signs of terror at sleeping in a dark room, though previously he had been accustomed to do this willingly. His parents thought it unwise to allow a light, and he woke night after night screaming. It was found that he believed a big cat with glowing eyes sat on the end of his bed, possibly the aftermath of a nightmare. He was given, not a light, but a woolly toy dog. He knew that dogs frightened cats away, and it was suggested to him that the cat dare not come now the dog was put on his bed. He accepted the suggestion and soon lost all fear. The essence of the cure is typical. It brought the morbid fear into connexion with his knowledge that dogs were a guard against cats, and by breaking down its isolation made it one thing amongst others, where it took a proper proportion. The complex is always out of proportion because it is isolated. Hence its power and hence too the reason why it can be cured by bringing it back to connexion with the rest of consciousness.

CHAPTER V

IMITATION AND SUGGESTION

The Importance of Imitation

I DO not think anyone knows why a parrot can talk and an eagle cannot. All we can say is that the parrot has the aptitude and uses it. The eagle has not. Just in the same way children imitate and cannot help imitating. It is 'in them,' inborn, and we have simply to make use of its enormous possibilities.

Imitation is an instinctive tendency, and takes different forms at different stages of a child's growth. Almost from birth, what is called 'reflex imitation' takes place. For example, a baby may cry simply because it hears another do so. Then comes 'spontaneous imitation,' when the tiny child imitates some sound or action that catches its attention, such as waving the hand to say good-bye, though it does not know what is the purpose of the action. Next comes 'voluntary imitation,' when the purpose of the action imitated is understood, and the child wants to do the same.

Even as early as the age of three or four, 'dramatic imitation' appears in such simple actions as playing at being a horse or a lion or a train. As the child grows older this dramatic representation becomes more exact and elaborate, and a delight is shown in acting parts, in taking a share in plays and 'dressing up.' The last stage is

'idealistic imitation,' or hero-worship, when the child's imagination is fired by some historical person, or character in fiction, or living individual, whom he copies.

There are in most children's development four fairly well marked stages of imitation, which we can recognize as follows: (1) Up to about six, imitation is spontaneous and individual; (2) Between six and twelve, deliberate imitation enters with the desire to learn. The home influence is at its maximum during this period. (3) From thirteen to about eighteen an independent period follows, the influence of school, and of groups within the school is stronger than either home or general influence. The untidiness of most boys during this period is a mark of this. (4) With adolescence comes a marked sensitiveness to the opinion of the opposite sex, and with this a general tendency to imitate the habits and customs of the time.

We recognize that these stages are usual, but the teacher who expects that children will follow the psychology textbook classifications will be doomed to disappointment. Children seldom do what they ought to, so we can hardly expect them to be so obliging as regularly to follow the expected stages. It will, however, remain true in all cases that an important part will be taken by imitation in the development of character.

Now, the general rule of the teacher is not to suppress any natural tendency, but to make it useful; and it seems a pity that the old Puritan mistrust of the stage, which, by the way, was in its day by no means unfounded prejudice, should be applied to-day to discourage a child's natural tendency to dramatic representation. Acting in a missionary pageant or scene, or representing scenes from the life of such a character as St. Francis, may be of far more educational use than any lesson on those subjects. One

can understand that the difficulty of giving a reverent representation of Christ may make it unwise to represent scenes from the Gospels; but this hardly applies equally to other Biblical stories. The possible harm^d that some people imagine may arise from dramatic representation should not be difficult to avoid, whilst the good uses of such a strong inborn tendency are much more important. The whole emphasis of modern educational psychology is upon using, not side-tracking, the materials Nature affords. On the general question, therefore, there is sound reason why dramatic representation should be utilized. When and how are matters which the good sense of those concerned must decide. No general rule is practicable.

Imitation and Character

On the broader issue of the influence of imitation on character we notice for one thing imitation is the great conservative factor in society. The children imitate the customs, right or wrong, of the elders, and so there comes the tendency for each generation to repeat the life of the last generation.

We recognize further that it is imitation which gives power to environment. It is not living in a slum, but copying the slum ways that create the slum type. As the Irishman said you could bring up a litter of pups in a cowshed but 'Sorra a bit of a moo would they give.' It is not the environment but imitation of it which has the influence. It is imitation which makes practice more powerful than precept. All of us realize how we acquired the point of view of our parents, shall we say regarding Sunday or Temperance, not so much by their deliberate instruction as by imitation of their attitude. Still, as we have said

before, the child who simply follows the good because he was taught to do so is not trained well.

The child is not a docile and slavish imitator, however. There is the 'shan't' period in most children's lives, and the hooligan period in the lives of many boys. Such methods as those of Montessori and Dalton are based on the recognition that children have an individuality that needs to be developed. Imitation of the good is good up to a certain point, but to try to create little copies of the correct pattern is a dreadful mistake, for, judging by the infinite variety of creation, it would seem to be the very last thing God wants.

Suggestion and its Uses

Suggestion is unwitting imitation, that is to say, it is the name we give to any process by which minds are unwittingly influenced. Deliberate imitation knowingly performed is not suggestion. The suggestor may act wittingly or unwittingly, but the suggestion is always received unwittingly. Sometimes one meets the word suggestibility, and that stands for the passive side of which suggestion is the active. It represents that condition of mind which is open to suggestion.

Suggestion has an enormously wide range in life; for example, tact is largely a matter of quickness to take in impressions suggested rather than said, and to act on them. Similarly the sensitiveness to 'atmosphere,' by which one means the quickness some people show in grasping the feeling of the place or times and responding to it, is also an example of suggestion. Another is the influence of those we think superior to us in position or skill or knowledge on our opinions or actions. We are apt to be greatly impressed and to imitate them, yet we are not aware directly of doing

so. Children are all hero-worshippers. The more impressive the informer and the more portentous the information, the more are we influenced by its suggestion—especially if it concerns something about which we are rather ignorant! Of course we differ in the amount of suggestibility we possess. Yet even those who are very stubborn and self-willed in matters that they are familiar with, are apt to be led easily enough when once they find themselves on unfamiliar ground or out of their depth.

For example, because a man is a shrewd man of business it does not follow that he will be a critical observer at a spiritualistic séance. Yet, together with a certain quantity of suggestibility all of us possess some 'contra suggestibility' or contrariness. As we have said there are stages of child-life when 'shan't' and 'won't' are heard very frequently. Outside influences and irritation are apt to make us contra-suggestible, and especially is this attitude marked towards those we dislike. The teacher who has 'fallen out' with the class will find that the tendency of his pupils will be to go in the direction opposite to that in which he tries to guide them. It may not be actual or open rebellion, but just unwitting contra-suggestion. That is why a poor teacher who is sympathetic often does better than a clever teacher who is hard and critical with children. Of course you can correct children's actions, but you cannot correct their thought, and it is that which counts.

Nor does it follow that the weak-willed child is easily led. Weak will may prevent it from guiding itself, but such children are often obstinate, or in other words contra-suggestible. None the less you can lead them where you can never drive them. The influence that you can exercise by suggestion is enormous. Indeed, when one comes to

think of it, is not 'influence' really another name for suggestion?

The Power of Suggestion

We must not forget that modification by environment, which is an important factor in evolution, means mental as well as physical environment. A child may go continually to the 'pictures' and be quite indifferent, but if the dramatic sense is strong, the suggestion of the films will be most powerful. That is why two children in the same home will respond so differently to the same home influence. The one is responsive to the suggestion breathed by that influence, the other is not. Both have to obey the same rules, but that is not the decisive factor. If it were, all children in the same home would be much alike.

After all, recollect that Judas had as much of the influence of the Master as his fellow-disciples, but Judas was hardened against the suggestion of the strongest influence that ever existed. That proves that the very best ways of training cannot succeed in every case. None the less, such exceptions are very rare. The great mass will respond readily enough to the right type of suggestion. The right type is usually unwitting. People who try consciously to exert a good influence usually fail, despite, or because of, their excellently intentioned efforts. Influence is the one thing that can be left to take care of itself. The right life will exert the right influence spontaneously. An interesting example of suggestion in moral teaching is afforded by St. Paul in Phil. iv. 8-9, 'Think on these things.' The apostle knew that if this advice were followed the result must be that a helpful suggestion would be created by the thought.

Notice, too, that the apostle prefers to tell us to think

about good rather than not to think about evil. Positive suggestion is always more powerful than negative. We are made more for the express purpose of doing something, and hence for child and for adult to do is easier than 'to don't.' There is far too much negative teaching given, 'Be sure you don't.' It is far better to say, 'Do this, and then you won't make the mistake of doing that.'

Auto-Suggestion

Auto-suggestion is simply the self-application of suggestion. I do not particularly believe in teaching children to auto-suggest. If the right type of thought is put before them in a way that appeals to their imagination, they will auto-suggest spontaneously, and this is much better than trying to teach deliberate or reflective auto-suggestion to young children. Finally, let us remind ourselves yet again that the twin powers of imitation and suggestion are the greatest factors of education, much greater than memory and reasoning. Imitation is deliberate, suggestion unwitting. Imitation refers more to outward action, suggestion to mental influence, although, of course, outward actions are mentally guided, and mental influences lead always to or towards some action. We can influence by suggestion even where we cannot persuade the children to imitation, and the influence of wholesome and sincere teaching remains, even where the lessons are ignored or forgotten, an ineffaceable suggestion for good.

CHAPTER VI

REACTIONS AND THEIR PLACE IN TEACHING

What are Reactions ?

OUR next concern is with 'reactions,' a word often found in the text-books. A reaction is a response, the reply to a stimulus. The stimulus may be the sight of an object or the sound of the teacher's voice. But having heard something or even having seen something, never leaves such a strong impression as is left by having done something. Hence the motto, 'No impression without expression': the expression is the reaction. The oldest and simplest method of teaching to obtain a reaction is to make the pupil repeat the words aloud, but there are other ways, writing out, drawing, experiments, and manual work. The point is to make the expression renew the impression. The instincts afford us 'inborn' reactions, and 'acquired' reactions are substitutes for, or modifications of, these. The teacher must try to use the inborn instincts and interests to develop the best acquired reactions.

We can roughly group the more important inborn reactions under three words that every child uses—Why? Mine! Look!

'Why?'

Why? refers to the instinct of curiosity, and the ready response it offers. The teacher will find that to stimulate

curiosity, and leave it to discover the facts, will make those facts much better recollected than if they are simply told. Do not answer every question. It is often better to leave the materials for, or the way to find out, the answer, and set the pupil to discover it. There cannot be curiosity without interest. To arouse either curiosity or interest means, therefore, to arouse both, for the one brings the other. Where there is already an interest, curiosity may be used to teach the children to widen the interest. Where there is none, first arouse curiosity. The interest will follow.

But how can I, asks the teacher, arouse curiosity about some of the lessons I have to teach? The answer is that interest spreads by association. Find some point upon which to arouse curiosity, even if it is a little remote from the lesson, connect it up, and the interest will be carried over. The teacher should ask 'why?' as well as the children. Ask interesting questions. Do not confine yourself to answering questions asked you, and you will make good use of this perennial reaction of childhood.

‘ Mine! ’

Mine! is another useful reaction. The acquisitive instinct is marked as early as a child's second year, sometimes earlier. Later it develops into the collecting craze, a habit that has many educational uses. Not so long ago I saw in a day-school a collection of matchboxes. The children in a certain class had been told to collect as many as possible from different countries. I had no idea so many nations sent us matches. Sweden, Belgium, Czecho-Slovakia, Poland, France, Ireland, and many others were represented.

What a splendid geography lesson, and how much better

than learning terrible lists of capes and bays which was the type of 'geography' to which I served a reluctant apprenticeship! Are there not possibilities here? At any rate, we may notice further that round the sense of ownership, and of personal achievement, many instincts and emotions are grouped: emulation and rivalry, pride and pugnacity. Rousseau urged that the only rivalry should be that of self-competition. But we have already said in an earlier chapter that healthy rivalry, especially of group against group, is particularly valuable. Then, too, the self-regarding instincts and sentiments, self-assertion, and abasement, love of praise, fear of blame, shyness, secretiveness, shame, and so forth, are also grouped here. Self-assertion may be 'sublimated' into determination, abasement into genuine humility, shyness into becoming modesty, secretiveness into proper reticence, whilst shame, praise, and blame are manifestly useful. Our aim is not to teach lessons, but to develop character, and we can do that only by using the materials the children's natures offer us.

'Look!'

Here we touch upon the imitative impulse and constructive instinct. Our idea of many things is simply and solely the use we make of them. How many of us know or want to know more about string, ink, or gum except the use we have for them? Similarly, we can teach children things by practical use that they will never learn otherwise. The dramatic sense, the love of taking a part, of presenting a character, country, or quality, offer us great possibilities. In a series of lessons on the early history of Israel let twelve children, for example, represent the twelve tribes. Give them coloured chalks and let them mark out their own territories on a blank map; or let each collect the history

of the tribe he represents. This type of lesson is always far more effective than the ordinary method of teaching.

Play

One of the most important inborn reactions is play. Play involves all the reactions of which we have been speaking in its own way, and the 'play-way' offers the teacher opportunities that are found nowhere else.

Why do children play? It is enough for most of us, perhaps, that they do, and it would be surprising to most people to learn that there are a number of theories that suggest reasons for what seems simply an obvious fact. Some have said that in play children repeat the activities of our primitive ancestry, but this would seem to make play useless. Others describe it as a safety-valve for letting off surplus energy, like the frisking of an unworked colt. This hardly accounts for the forms play takes, though it explains mere 'letting off steam' in running and shouting. A further view is that which sees in play an apprenticeship to life. Play is the way in which the young learn the activities they will need to exercise later. This accounts very well for much of the play of young animals, though it makes play in later life a mere survival. Others, again, see in play the line of least resistance. We are made active, and play is the easiest and pleasantest type of activity.

We ought not to overlook the fact that play has a mental side. Generally speaking, the higher animals play more than the lower, and children, of course, more than all. Activity is the fundamental characteristic of human nature, and play gives it the necessary outlet. Later in life, when work enters, it absorbs much of this activity. Though work and play are commonly contrasted, the only difference between them is the element of compulsion, sometimes of

drudgery in work contrasted with the freedom of play. In schools where games are compulsory many children hate them. Work, moreover, seldom satisfies all our impulses ; often, for example, it gives no place for muscular activity. Adults, therefore, play for the same reason as do children. In both, surplus energy may prompt play, and children and young animals who have not to find their own food or fulfil any definite task naturally have more energy to spare. Play provides them with an outlet for their developing powers. There are other factors in children's play, the inborn tendency to imitate finds satisfaction, the impulse of rivalry, the desire to increase skill, and the constructive instinct, together with the delightful exercise of imagination. All these prompt play and suggest the forms it takes.

The Educational Use of Play

The modern teacher realizes that a hard and fast contrast between work and play is foolish. The play impulse can find a place in the class-room as well as on the play-ground. It can stimulate effort, and add interest to work. Compulsion never yet made any child put out his full energies. It may be true that to make work play would be to create the wrong spirit, for the seriousness of work, the application it demands, might be thus lost. But there is no reason why some of the impulses which make play so fascinating should not enter into work. In the Primary Department this is done ; it is seldom remembered afterwards. But especially when the teacher has a separate class-room and need not distract other classes, to arrange a dramatization of the lesson, to give some scope for ' make-believe,' to let the children draw or hunt up points for themselves makes for much more effective teaching than the mere exposition of a subject.

REACTIONS AND THEIR PLACE IN TEACHING 53

Another point to bear in mind is the fellowship of play. The day-school teacher knows the value of play as a point of contact between his pupils and himself. Sunday-school teachers cannot have the same opportunities, of course, but they can at least make it their task to be interested in the play-interests of their children. Play is one of the avenues to a child's heart. It is, even in the discussion of it, a bond of interest which will open up the way to free conversation with children, a thing some teachers find not at all easy.

Play and Religion

It is not everyone who knows that although play is instinctive, organized games had in most, if not all cases, a religious, or at least a ritual significance. In some English towns a game of football is still played in the streets on Shrove Tuesday. As late as the sixteenth century a ball game was played in the church at Auxerre, when the dean and canons sang, danced, and tossed a ball about in the nave. These are survivals of very ancient custom. Even the primitive Australian aborigines have a ceremonial ball game. The earliest dramatic representations had similar connexions with the religious side of man's life, at a time when religion and magic were hardly separate, and religious plays were common in the Middle Ages. There are many instances of sacred dances. That religion and play have nothing in common is as false, then, historically as it is in fact. To develop Scout and Guide troops, to organize and arrange games are not a sort of concession to attract children to religious teaching. They are an essential part of that teaching. To bring religion into children's lives and leave untouched that great part

of child life that is covered by play is utter folly. We need to revive the old alliance between religion and play, and let the children see that Christianity gladdens everything, work and play alike.

Speaking of the reactions generally, it must be remembered that whilst they are permanent, the forms they take change rapidly, and fresh forms have continually to be found. Which reactions to obtain and when, no one can teach you. You must find it out yourself. Remember, too, that the 'naughty' or restless child is often merely showing his strong native reactions, and, therefore, may be much more promising material than the 'good' child who is not energetic enough to give trouble. Whilst for ease in teaching most of us prefer a quiet class; if the teacher can control a troublesome class, there are often more possibilities in such lads or girls. So if the challenge is thrown out to you, accept it and see if you can make good with the troublesome class. If you can, well, it will be good.

CHAPTER VII

HABIT AND ITS LAWS

The Bodily Basis of Habit

WE have all noticed often how running water will hollow out its channel in the yielding earth, or even in the unyielding rock. We have seen the pebbles on the beach polished and rounded by the ceaseless action of the waves, and climbed the weather-scarred face of the headland by the little path worn by the fishermen's feet. And the channel is worn, the stones smoothed, the track beaten out, in the same way. The constant repetition of a certain experience is all that is needed.

So with machinery. A locomotive, even a bicycle, works more easily after a little while than at first; the constant action of the running parts soon overcomes the initial friction and resistance. So, too, the coat eases, the uncomfortable new boots 'shape to the foot,' the new hat to the wearer's head.

The human body tells the same story. The adjustment and accommodation of muscles in a Paderewski or a Kubelik or, shall we say in a juggler, a billiard player, a cricketer, are marvellous. At the slightest cue, a whole series of complicated and often intensely rapid movements are performed with a mechanical precision and accuracy that seems to admit no possibility of error. This suggests a parallel with our habits of life and conduct. Behind

every habit there is a physiological factor, and just as the muscles adapt themselves to the modes in which they are exercised, so does our nervous system; for, though the expression must not be too closely pressed, we can say that every habit is due to the formation of a brain 'path,' down which, on the way of least resistance, the reaction to the stimulus travels. This may not be precise phrasing, but it is perhaps the simplest way of putting the facts. Why, for example, does it take twice as long to say the alphabet backwards as it does to say it in the usual way? For the simple reason that the well-known order is a familiar 'path'; for the reverse order the track has to be found by successive exertions of thought. Now all habits as constantly repeated experiences are, in their physiological aspect, represented by such paths. Thought and action are apt to take the easiest line of discharge, which lies down the paths of habit. Thus behind even the most trivial of habits is a physical factor which makes itself felt in the constant tendency to repeat an habitual action, whenever the appropriate stimulus occurs, in preference to reacting in an unfamiliar way. This is a great conservative agent, making all change of habit difficult in proportion as the habit has become ingrained and established.

The Growth and Use of Habit

We may link what we said in the last chapter to this by reminding ourselves that habits are acquired reactions. A baby is born with the full range of instincts, some active almost from the first, some dormant to develop later, but it has no habits. It is doubtful whether any habits are inherited, apart from physical habits such as 'mannerisms,' and improbable that any habit acquired during the lifetime of the parent can be inherited by the children.

Some, indeed, would say impossible, not improbable. Hence the great importance of habit forming. When we grow older, ninety per cent. of our actions are habits, and habits of thought are almost as prevalent as bodily habits. Then as we grow older, our habits 'set' like plaster of Paris hardening, and that is why William James said that old fogeyism began at twenty-five! Yet life without habits would be intolerable. Fancy having to think definitely how to take every step or frame our lips to every word! Habit is a splendid servant. We can delegate to it the whole routine of life and be free to think about the more important part. But the Bible says something of the peril of a 'servant when he ruleth,' and habit that rules us is a bad master.

Habit should be the servant of resolution, and such a good servant it will become, that we may safely leave it, after a while, as deputy in charge of the whole business to which resolution is devoted. For example, we resolve to spend each day a short time in reading, prayer, or meditation. That resolve will be a resolve, and nothing more, unless it is merged in a habit. But only give the resolve an outlet: choose ten minutes before coming down in the morning, and for three months, whatever happens, give the time, busy or not, cold morning or warm, and in all probability, at the end of that time, the resolution will be lost in the habit. But let the resolution find spasmodic expressions only at odd times, and sooner or later, probably sooner, it will die the death.

Resolutions only become effective in habit. A man may resolve to swim, and at his first attempts the action of arms and legs is always in his mind, and constant attention is paid to acquiring the right stroke. If habit did not come to the rescue, this constant effort would in time

become intolerable, and unless the resolve was continually renewed and enforced, it would probably lapse ; even if it were persisted in, the irritation it would produce would destroy all the pleasure of the swim. It is exactly so with resolutions of moral importance. Unless we ease the strain of repeated resolutions, by making the end to which they are directed in some way at least automatic, the chances are all against the persistence of the resolution.

It is a commonplace to say that we are creatures of habit, but no commonplace receives more abundant illustration. As an illustration of unwitting habits, notice how all have their own peculiar gait. They are unaware that they walk differently from other people, yet they do, and probably could not change their gait without long and persistent practice. From morning to night, whatever we do, great or small, is more or less done in an habitual manner, and the unfamiliar actions of life are set about in the way habit has made familiar. I have watched a policeman who was appointed sidesman putting strangers into pews in a way that suggested irresistibly regulating the traffic. A few minutes given to examination of the way in which we perform the trivialities of life will astonish us. We find ourselves with clockwork order and regularity, not deviating a hair's breadth from a routine which has become so automatic that we are wholly unaware of its existence.

Our moral life is a matter of habit and it is in no way derogatory to it to point this out. After all, good habits must be formed, and if we blame the sinner for his evil habits, why should there be any stint of praise to the saint, even if his goodness is habitual to him, even as the other's badness is to him ? But, one way or other, habits of life and thought and conduct we *must* have—habits backed up by the body itself, so that in a literal sense the

better self wars against the flesh, or else has the flesh, its own body, on its side. What is needful is so to train our nervous system for good, that if we have the foe without us, we have the friend within; for character is not an abstraction, but has a counterpart in physical fact, written indelibly by the pen of experience in fibre and brain-cell.

Making and Breaking Habits

There are a few simple psychological rules about making and breaking habits which we must remember. A habit may be begun deliberately or unwittingly. If we desire to form a habit, shall we say to embed a good resolution in habit, the main point is to allow of no exceptions. As James put it, in winding a ball of string, every time we drop the ball undoes far more than we wind every time we twist round it. So with habit. The lapses count far more than the successes. Similarly in breaking a habit; the sudden way is generally better than the gradual. The value of a public pledge, of calling to others to witness our resolution and to take us to task if we fail is considerable, because it reinforces our intention by our pride. We are much more humiliated by our public than by our private failures. Hence the value of a friend to whom we can convey our resolution.

It is therefore a sound maxim that advises the one who would form a new habit, or break off an old one, to make the decision as emphatic and memorable as possible, and to start to practise it, to act upon it, at once, and in every possible manner *going out of the way even to find opportunities to do so*. Every new habit has to make its way at the expense of the old, and old-established habits die hard. They have their standing, and recur again and again. The new habit has to gain its ground, and hold it,

and crowded out it will certainly be unless it has the will as its ally, not simply to plant it, but to guard it, night and day, until it gains root. It is far better in most cases to cut off a bad habit by one firm decision, than to attempt to wean oneself by degrees. The sharp resistance rouses us, brings out all the fight in us; it is death or victory, and the habit is killed; but when we lay siege, it is a tedious business; our enthusiasm wanes, our thought wanders, the siege raises itself, and the habit remains to fortify itself more strongly against a second attack.

The same truth applies, if anything in a more striking way, to the making as well as to the breaking of habit. There is much to be said psychologically, as well as in other ways, for sudden conversion. If only it is real, the strong resolution, the emotional upheaval, the concentration of will, are all in favour of the keeping of the new ways; but the more strong is the initial resolve the more serious does a lapse become. In climbing the slippery heights every false step sends us back a distance that took us many painful steps to attain. We see here the practical meaning of the precept 'Overcome evil with good.' Every habitual action occurs in response to some stimulus, however slight and unnoticed, and the occurrence of this stimulus we cannot always control. If we can allow it an outlet in something that is good, or at least harmless, it will prove far easier than endeavouring wholly to repress a reaction which will constantly recur.

A further point is to remember that suggestion is better than mere determination. A certain number of failures will probably occur, and we may grow discouraged. The remedy is on the lines of Coué's celebrated formula. Think you are doing better, tell yourself it will come with patience, and keep on. That method never fails if one persists.

A good character is simply a bundle of good habits, and the only good that is securely based is that firm set in habit.

I close with a striking quotation from William James's famous chapter on habit to which much of what has been said here is due.

'The physiological study of mental conditions is thus the most powerful ally of hortatory ethics. The hell to be endured hereafter, of which theology tells, is no worse than the hell we make for ourselves in this world by habitually fashioning our characters in the wrong way. Could the young but realize how soon they will become mere walking bundles of habits, they would give more heed to their conduct while in the plastic state. We are spinning our own fates, good or evil, and never to be undone. Every smallest stroke of virtue or of vice leaves its never so little scar. The drunken Rip van Winkle in Jefferson's play excuses himself for every fresh dereliction by saying, "I won't count it this time!" Well! he may not count it, and a kind Heaven may not count it; but it is being counted none the less. Down among his nerve-cells and fibres the molecules are counting it, registering and storing it up to be used against him when the next temptation comes. Nothing we ever do is in strict scientific literalness wiped out. Of course this has its good side as well as its bad one. As we become permanent drunkards by so many separate drinks, so we become saints in the moral, and authorities and experts in the practical and scientific spheres, by so many separate acts and hours of work' (*Principles of Psychology*, vol. i, p. 127).

CHAPTER VIII

INTEREST AND ATTENTION

How to Get Attention

ONE of the most perplexing practical problems of every teacher is how to gain and keep attention. We have already said that attention depends upon interest. There is a natural mechanism in every mind for selecting certain parts out of the total number of sensations and images that compose the whole field of consciousness. No one ever attends, or can attend, to everything that at any given moment is before consciousness in its widest sense. Certain stimuli seem by nature to obtain preferential treatment ; for example, anything sudden, loud, bright, novel, and also any moving object. To those we involuntarily pay attention in normal circumstances ; but it is hardly possible for a teacher to rely to any great extent on making frequent use of this type of attention. A new subject, or the object in an object-lesson, may for the time obtain it, but soon the novelty wears off.

We must remember, however, that it is also true that interest may come by reason of attention. For example, the interest we ultimately came to have in many school subjects was created by the attention we had to give. At first many of them seemed dull and unattractive. But as we slowly mastered them we began to find some of them interesting. In this instance, therefore, interest followed

attention. With these facts in mind, the teacher begins by creating an interest, and this in turn creates attention, which in its turn will tend to create a fresh interest, and so the cycle goes on. Two things are always without interest, the very old and the very new. We can understand why the very old should have outworn its interest, but is it true of the very new? Surely any novelty is interesting in itself! Yet it is not so. For example, I happened to speak of a friend of mine. A lad was in the room, obviously bored with the conversation of the elders. I chanced to mention that my friend was an English International footballer. Instantly the lad began to ask questions about him. As long as my friend was someone he did not know he had no interest in him. But he had a keen interest in football, and as soon as the new subject—that is to say, my friend—was linked with the old interest, it became interesting. The teacher, therefore, who broaches a new subject is always wise in linking it to an existing interest.

A further fact to be remembered is the way interest spreads. The interest in motors is likely to extend itself to aeroplanes, in horses to saddlery, and so forth. In a similar way the teacher can utilize interest in one subject or story and spread it over to further developments. Attention can exist without interest, but it is obtained only by effort, and is soon found to flag. Such attention is called voluntary attention, but the only attention that is easy is involuntary, when interest, that is to say, has captured attention and attention is given without effort. Of the things we learn, those acquired by voluntary attention are soonest forgotten; witness some of the dull school subjects in which we were once proficient. Yet they never possessed any abiding interest, and so they slipped from

memory. I knew a Sunday-school superintendent who began his address by banging on the desk and shouting, 'Listen, children.' If he saw anyone apparently unheeding he repeated his demand, or inquired if the offender desired to be sent out of the school. By a sort of terrorism, he gained a hearing, but he made no lasting impression. His successor was a much less imposing person, who could begin in a natural and interesting way to tell a story, and before he had been speaking a minute there was not a restless child in the school.

Attention as Voluntary and Involuntary

Of course, it is possible to ask for voluntary or deliberate attention. A trained mind can do a great deal in this way ; a child's mind, however, but little. An adult, with practice, can give a certain amount of voluntary attention, but a child must not be expected to do so. If, then, we cannot rely upon the voluntary effort to sustain attention, and if involuntary attention so soon diminishes, what can be done? The answer is that the two can be blended. We must rely on involuntary attention at the start. For the time being that will serve to keep away distractions. The lesson that starts dully is doomed from the outset. Then as the first involuntary attention wanes, voluntary attention will be wanted, and this can be given if there is sufficient interest. For example, a child is attracted to a cross-word puzzle, the first time he attempts one, by its novelty. If, however, the clues are too difficult, he will soon throw it down. But if the clues are within his reach, and he solves part of it, the fascination of the problem will create a deliberate, voluntary, and sustained effort to solve it. He will not need to try to avoid distraction. His attention will become that mixture of involuntary and

voluntary attention which has been called 'secondary passive (or involuntary) attention.' This is precisely what the teacher has to aim at and hope to secure for the lesson he presents to his class, a continuous attention sustained by interest, not effort.

The First Law of Teaching

The first law of teaching then is: Be interesting. It is not the greatest thing, but it is the most needful. To be interesting you must know the children's interests; but, more than that, you must share them. There is something pitiable in the grown-up professing an obviously feigned enthusiasm for children's interests. However well-intentioned it may be, it is certain to turn out a miserable failure. It is almost impossible to interest others in what does not interest you. Of course, the broadcaster may not be at all interested in news he is reading out, while his listeners may be breathlessly excited about it. But, apart from this kind of thing, the rule holds good that interest must be caught; it cannot be instilled. Yet nothing is more contagious than interest. Think of the many interests in our own life we have thus gained from our friends. None, then, need fear that they will fail as teachers if they are interested in their subject and in children's interests. The truest type of fondness for children is not to be fond of them in the way in which you can be fond of an animal or a hobby, but to be fond of the things of which they are fond. That is the direct route to their hearts.

CHAPTER IX

ASSOCIATION AND MEMORY

Association and Character

IF anyone reading this heading thinks first that it refers to football, he is wrong, but the mistake is an interesting example of the psychological laws of association none the less, because the fact that the word association recalled football to his mind rather than any other of the many possible ideas that could link with the term, shows that football was uppermost in his subconscious mind at the moment. Perhaps that is its usual place; perhaps he had just been thinking about or reading of it. Anyway it might be said that our mental associations are a pretty good indication of our character. The sight of the man fallen among thieves suggested perhaps to the priest that if he were contaminated with blood it would make him unclean, and not wishing to have to purify himself, he hurried past. The Levite possibly thought it was a dangerous spot, and hastened on to save himself lest the thieves were still about. The Samaritan thought only of helping. In each case the sight was the same, but the different associations it recalled give us three different types of character. It is on this account that it is so interesting and useful for the teacher to study the associations of the children's minds. Nothing shows more clearly their mental age, character, and dispositions. Of course, to a certain extent children say what they think is expected of them, but the teacher

who can get the children to be natural and at ease will not often be misled by this.

The Teacher's Use of Association

Association is important in other ways. The teacher who would make a point secure, is wise in making it the centre, and attaching to it a number of associations, so that mentally it is 'pegged down,' held like the tent pole by ropes in all directions. Jesus when teaching brought a number of different parables to bear on the same point. That is precisely what I am advocating now. Some of the most effective and memorable sermons centre round one single idea and keep coming back to it from different angles. A good teacher repeats, but repetition need not be monotonous reiteration. It is the most effective when each illustration is different and yet all are brought to one centre.

A further consideration should be recollected in this connexion. Many good illustrations fail because, though good in themselves, they do not carry the point with them. Presumably some point or 'moral' is intended. It should be integral with the story, not ingeniously tacked on to it. Otherwise the listeners will recollect the story but forget the moral, which will become mentally detached and lost, having no association with it. A further point merits notice. The aim of all education is to make wide fields of association. Someone has said that a dewdrop is round for the same reason that the earth is round, but clearly only a trained mind would associate the two. Similarly, the picturesque story of Newton and the apple, which the higher critics have declared false. They cannot leave Eve with her apple or Newton with his ! However, let them be, and let us imagine that Newton was led by the fall of the apple to formulate the law of gravity. What other mind

would have connected the two? It follows then that education is largely a matter of making wide associations, and indeed one characteristic of genius is its power to make unusual associations.

Most young children share, to some extent, in this power, and within limits it should be encouraged. Perhaps our educational methods tend to stereotype too much, to erase the child's native originality instead of bringing it out. Let the teacher strive to fashion on the untrodden grounds of a child's mind a well-laid-out map of associations, useful, direct, and systematic, though the best systems are never cut and dried—after all what more than this can the most complete education realize?

Memory

Plato once likened the mind to a block of wax that received and retained impressions, and we cannot go much beyond this, for no one knows why impressions should be retained, nor why some are retained so much better than others. All of us know how little trivialities will sometimes remain for a lifetime, and far bigger events be lost. Probably, however, no impression is utterly gone, though it may be unrecallable.

Yet the way that forgotten memories can be occasionally revived suggests that all might be revived could we but get the right associations. We do know that a great deal that cannot be normally recalled may still be influential in the unconscious part of the mind. When we speak therefore of childish fears and troubles as being soon forgotten, we are wrong. They leave traces which may be of tremendous importance in the child's after years. If modern psychology has shown one thing more than any other

as of importance, it is this, namely, the great influence of childhood experiences, buried and 'forgotten,' on after life.

Turning now to the subject of memory as it applies to teaching, the first thing to remember is that no normal child has a bad memory for all things. The boy who cannot remember dates will probably remember the Football League tables with uncanny accuracy. The difference, of course, is in the interest.

To improve interest, therefore, is to improve memory, and certainly it is the best way of doing so. In the days of educational barbarism they used to 'improve' memory by giving long lists of useless stuff to be learnt by heart. The method is not only bad, but it is sheer waste of time, for no amount of memorizing in one subject seems of any effective help in improving the memory for a totally different subject. It is probable that our memories are fixed powers, which cannot be improved in themselves, but can be made much more effective by proper use. Everyone knows that a good packer can get half as much again into a bag of a certain size as a bad packer can. So with memory. So to speak, we cannot enlarge the bag, but we can greatly improve the packing. We have already spoken of interest. Another important point is association. This underlies all systems of memory training. The art consists in linking the fact to be remembered with the facts which are easily remembered because of their interest, and the former will then be carried along with the latter. This is of obvious importance to the teacher. When speakers say: 'In the first place,' 'second place,' and so on, they are utilizing a method as old as the Greeks, though probably few know it. The Greek rhetoricians taught their pupils to think of a house, and mentally to put their points into each room

or place. Think of the dining-room and point one, the sleeping-room and point two, and so forth.

In this way a simple outline was prepared, and the speaker had his clues associated with something he knew well. The best type of memory is not that which learns most rapidly, but that which recalls most rapidly and recalls the essentials, whilst omitting the needless. Only a parrot memory recalls everything alike and in absolute order.

Experiments in Forgetting

Ebbinghaus conducted a series of experiments in which he set pupils to learn certain nonsense syllables. These were speedily forgotten. When the pupil could remember none of them he was set to relearn them, and in every case did so in less time than he originally took for learning them. That is encouraging proof that the forgotten is never wholly useless. It can be revived more rapidly than if it had not been taught. Further experiments prove that most of us learn best by breaking up the portion to be learned into fair-sized sections, and learning these successively. This is usually a quicker process than learning line by line, or trying to master a long piece at once. There are individual differences, but in the main this is correct. Further, better results are obtained if time is allowed for the impression to sink in before we start to go over it a second time. In other words constantly returning to it is better than sticking continuously to it. In such ways does psychology give its practical help to the teacher who wants to get the best results and use the most economical methods.

CHAPTER X

APPERCEPTION: OR HOW THE MIND RECEIVES IMPRESSIONS

The Meaning of 'Apperception'

THIS is a technical term, and we must at all costs avoid the impression that our science thrives on technical terms, so let me explain that it is not so bad as it looks. There is a story of a man who, having taken pills for his liver, a draught for rheumatism, an aspirin for headache, wondered how they would all 'get to the right place.' Well, how do the mental impressions we get, sort themselves?

Take a word like spot. It may refer to a mark, a place, a dog, a microscope, a billiard ball. Why does one association come up rather than another? The answer to these questions brings us to the subject of apperception, which may be defined as the process by means of which the mind appropriates new elements to itself. The interest of this subject lies in the fact that it introduces us to the ways in which minds grow and widen. Look for a moment at the way in which our minds apperceive, that is to say, appropriate and assimilate new perceptions and thoughts. First by analogy: the new is linked to what we already know by means of some analogy or similarity. Natives who see an aeroplane for the first time almost invariably

call it a bird. An American Indian on first seeing a train described it as 'a fire devil running away with a lot of huts.' A little girl born in India seeing snow, cried out ecstatically that the angels were moulting. So too our own railway nomenclature, driver, guard, coach, road, and so forth was borrowed from the stage coaching days, an interesting example of the way in which we assimilate the new by the old. It will also be realized that the reception given to new ideas varies considerably according to bias or interest. There are none so blind as those who won't see. Darwin tells us that he never needed to write down facts favourable to his theories, but unless he wrote down contradictory facts he forgot them—a very illuminating remark which explains why some people can never see more than one side of the question.

Yet again we must bear in mind that our powers of reception of anything new are modified by our existing system of thought. Many a discovery has been made and forgotten because it came too soon. Later it is rediscovered. In a book fifty years old I came across the following: 'We have begun to suspect a large number of our diseases to be caused by organic germs. Our ignorance about these germs is most complete.' Think what different associations the word germ has to-day. In other words how differently we apperceive it from the way in which our grandfathers did.

Of course, it is possible as we have already suggested, that a new idea or perception may be assimilated or apperceived in more than one way; 'spot' for example again. If we were playing billiards and heard someone say spot we should think of the ball. If we were looking for stains on a cloth and heard the word spot we should think of a mark. The cluster or mass of ideas, or complex, dominant

at the moment, or habitually dominant, tends always to absorb each first presentation to itself, and so for the man with a fixed idea everything becomes food for that one idea and no other.

‘ Apperception-Masses ’

By apperception, then, we mean the process of assimilating what we experience, for everyone will understand that teaching is not simply the task of imparting information irrespective of the listener. Two children will understand the same lesson very differently; both hear it, and both understand, but how much they understand, and in what way they understand, will depend on their powers of apperception. In one child's mind there is an ‘ apperception-mass ’ of facts and interests to which the lesson will be at once related. The other child has no such ‘ mass,’ and though he hears and understands, the lesson will have much less meaning as far as he is concerned. What we have called by the rather cumbrous term ‘ apperception-mass ’ might be called without serious inaccuracy, interests. Now, in childhood and early youth our interests are formed, few old folks take up new pursuits. Now and again one sees a greybeard piloting a car, but very rarely. In most cases our interests cease to be added to when we are past thirty, though we may change their character somewhat, as when the old cricketer takes to golf. The importance of imparting a spiritual apperception-mass, or interest, to the young is evident therefore. Unless it is put there in youth it will seldom grow later.

You may not be aware of the name of the tavern down the street. You pass it often, but having no special interest in taverns, fail to recollect its name. The man in the bar there has passed your church many times, and

except that he is vaguely aware that some sort of a building exists, he will not know anything more about it, and for the life of him could not direct you to the particular church. So do our interests limit our knowledge, and so it is true that unless the spiritual interest is in a man, no amount of appeals and invitations will make much impression on him. He is not opposed, he is simply uninterested. The Sunday-school teacher has to lay the foundation for the evangelist of years to come, and if it be not laid, the evangelist will have small chance. You have not necessarily failed if you do not retain the elder scholars, provided that you have put something into their minds that may be awakened again in later life.

A Child's Interests

Following on what has been said, it is useful to notice how the interests of childhood are acquired. The first is in the sensible properties of material things, in construction for example. At this stage thinking is concrete and to make a crèche will ensure that the story of Bethlehem is remembered far more certainly than if the story is merely told or even shown in pictures. The next stage is that of causal associations, the questioning or 'why' stage; here thinking is practical. Finally, in seniors, comes abstract associations when thinking is verbal, and the mind mature. It is a great mistake to push a child ahead of the stage to which he belongs.

I can recollect, what I now think of as veritable methods of barbarism, making children of four or five repeat the catechism, and children a trifle older learn the whole of the 119th Psalm by heart. Without wishing to make undue claims, one may at least say that it is due more

than anything else to psychology that we have learnt a better way, and mindful of children's natural interests, teach in harmony with them.

The practical application of our talk about apperception then is on the following lines. The success of any lesson depends as much upon the hearers' minds as upon its own qualities. Hence the teacher's first task is to gauge the mental level of the class. Question and answer is the best method for this purpose.

Every fisherman knows that fish will rise to take certain flies and reject others. The mind 'rises' to take in certain ideas in a very similar way. As a 'fisher of men,' or of children, you must find what these ideas are. Two questions must be before the teacher's mind always. The first is to what interest already in the mind can I link what I have to say? The second is what does this mean, not to me, but to the children? A child may know certain things by heart and yet be wholly ignorant of them. If this sentence seems a contradiction, read it again and think why it is not. In my school days they made us repeat the counties of Scotland in order: Orkney and Shetland, Caithness, Sutherland, Cromarty, Ross. I can still repeat the list, but I am horribly ignorant of the geography of Scotland. It is equally possible to name all the kings of Israel and be wholly untaught in Scripture. We are not succeeding as teachers merely in imparting lumps of knowledge. The best education is that which gives the most orderly and clearest system of facts linked to practical ends.

I cannot be too emphatic in urging that the aim before every teacher is not merely to familiarize children with certain Bible stories, but to implant a 'mass,' some definite spiritual ideas in their minds, for example that love must

be the guiding principle not force, that the weak and helpless are the first to be considered, that the golden rule is absolute. A number of Bible names and stories is not a religious education. We succeed only in so far as we make Christian principles motives and not mere memories in the mind.

CHAPTER XI

IMAGINATION AND DAY DREAMING

The Place of Imagination

It is a good thing that Mr. Gradgrind and Josiah Bounderby do not exist to-day, for their passion for 'facts' would be considerably shocked by the place and importance given to imagination by modern teachers. 'Imagination! Nonsense. Mere moonshine. If any child is imaginative, whip it out of him, sir!' So, one fancies, would Gradgrind have spoken. But we have learnt nowadays that the weak things of the mind may confound the mighty, and are prepared to admit that make-believe may sometimes have bigger results than stern reality.

We have even classed and labelled different types of imagination. Some children, perhaps most, belong to the visual type, and picture their thoughts. But there are other types—auditory, tactile, and motor, they are called, according as sound, touch or movement predominate. Of course, it partly depends on the object. You cannot imagine a star in terms of touch, though you can imagine it in sight, or by movement, mentally following its outline. Often, of course, two types blend. The gesticulation of a speaker is sometimes the natural movement of his arms as he points out the features of some scene before his mind. Yet, apart from all this, it is curious to find that most

people belong chiefly to one of the four types. It is said that a Red Indian wood-carver, asked to make a duplicate of a certain article, declined to take it away as a model, asking only to be allowed to run his fingers over it. The touch and movement images he thus got enabled him, without seeing the model, to reproduce it accurately. It is interesting for any teacher to test a class's powers of imagination to find which children are limited and which are free in imaginative powers, and under which type they imagine. It is not merely a matter of curiosity. It will tell something about the working of the children's minds.

Imagination and Action

If we go on to speak of the power of imagination we shall see that it is not the airy, inconsequential thing that we sometimes fancy. Our psychology talks have already familiarized us with the thought that nothing that passes through the mind is ever lost, even if it is 'forgotten.' Then, too, the tendency of all thought is always towards action. It may not be immediate, but what we have thought about may at a later time suggest itself as a course of action, or influence an action. Imagination wanders and vanishes, but some day what we saw in imagination will come back as a motive for action.

Everyone knows how we forget a name, search for it, give it up, and later it flashes out of our subconscious mind. We had ceased to think, but our subconscious mind went on working and found it for us. In just the same way we cease to imagine and turn our thought to something else, but the daydream goes on below consciousness, still at work in us. Because imagination seems small and unsubstantial compared with serious thinking, never despise it.

An age which has learnt the might of the invisible atom and the microscopic germ has learnt that the things that seem inconsequential are often the things that count.

The Power of Imagination

Imagination, then, is a power. It is said that the story of the corruption of men and nations begins with imagination, that the art and literature of a country afford the signs of its first decadence. It is equally true that noble acts begin in germ in the imagination. Those who think heroically are taking the first step to acting heroically. The impure imagination is the first step towards the impure act. Then, again, imagination makes our ideals and our ideals make our character. Here, for example, is the boy who is mad to go to sea. His imagination pictures the life of a sailor as an unending romance. Nothing will prevent him from going to sea. He goes, and finds that it is not all he thought, but the chances are that he will stick to it and live the life of a sailor. His imagination has determined his life.

Another point that we may notice is how closely imagination and imitation are linked. The boy whose imagination is fired by the exploits of a cinema actor is found imitating his ideal. Is it not plain, then, that a teacher's work is to make the Master appeal to the imagination, not merely to teach facts about His life as if it were a history lesson? If the seed is sown in the imagination the fruit will come in the life. Is there, after all, any figure that can appeal to the imagination more than the ideal Man, Christ Jesus?

Imagination is closely linked with character. Why is it that we intuitively like or dislike, trust or suspect people

we meet? Often it is done without the least shadow of evidence to justify our attitude. Yet we are confident that our judgements are grounded upon something, and often they are surprisingly correct. It seems possible that we have some means of sensing the character of a man's imagination.

To a certain extent his thoughts write themselves on his face, modify his voice and manner. No one can give a rational account of the signs that indicate this, but we know them intuitively, none the less. Sometimes our estimates are mistaken, but that is often because some mannerism has deceived us. In the main they are correct, and in so far as they are, this seems due to an intuitive glimpse of the character of another's imagination. We cannot read his thoughts, but we can read the marks they have left upon his manner and appearance, and on this ground base our estimate. So does the inner imagination show itself outwardly.

A fruitful subject opens itself if we go on to speak of :

The Uses of Imagination

It is most important for educational purposes to remember this aspect. Everyone knows that the children prefer picture books to those that are unillustrated. Some teachers can teach like a picture-book ; that is, they can paint pictures that make the children see the story as if it were visibly illustrated. It is a wonderful gift, for such teachers can never be dull. The compliment I think I prize most was paid me by a farm boy. I preached at a village chapel to a very few, and tried to make the story of St. Peter's denial appear before my hearers' eyes. I was a little doubtful, but someone told me he asked a

farm lad how he liked the service. 'Fine,' he replied; 'it was just like the pictures.'

Then I knew that I had not failed. The teacher who can set the children's imagination to provide the illustration to accompany the story must have imagination personally, and the power to excite it. Most of us have heard how Whitefield was once vividly describing a man wandering towards the edge of a precipice, and a noble lord in his congregation was so wrought upon that, forgetting everything, he cried aloud, 'By Gad, he's over!' Such was Whitefield's power of word painting.

The Misuse of Imagination

But what of misuse? Some people think that children love the most fantastic and nonsensical stories. Few do. There is a practicability about most children that makes them prefer either true stories or stories that may be true, that are not intrinsically absurd. 'Is it really true?' they ask. Some people think it good fun to make a child believe nonsense. It is wholly bad. For one thing, it will ultimately destroy the child's trust in what you say. For that reason, for my own part I would never even insist on the venerable Santa Claus myth if a child began to suspect and ask if it were true.

Your children's trust in you is too precious to be risked. Not only so, but when the distinction between fact and fancy is blurred, Nemesis often comes in the child's untruthfulness. Can you wonder at it? Certainly education should not destroy imagination, yet its purpose is to give reality, not bare facts, but still true facts. There is plenty of romance in truth with which to feed imagination, and a better fairyland in science than in any fairy tale. Kipling

has said that 'Romance brought up the 9.15'; and he speaks truly.

Which is worse, the prosaic dullard or the empty dreamer, Gradgrind or Harold Skimpole, to go to Dickens once more? I hardly dare guess. But if ever the right way was the middle way, as wise old Aristotle thought, it is here. Vision is essential. The Book of Proverbs tells us that where there is none the people cast off restraint; but you must 'hitch your wagon to a star,' not weave cobwebs round it. The star of imagination must draw the useful matter-of-fact wagon along. The teacher's ideal is to make imagination an aid in education, not a plaything for idle moments.

Children's Day-Dreams

One particular form of imagination merits further notice, the day-dream. Children day-dream more than adults, and that for several reasons. For one, the adult generally has practical bread-and-butter problems to keep him occupied. Then, too, he has acquired a more rigid system of belief about facts which limits his fancies, and makes a sharp division between romance and reality. Some children fail to make such a distinction, and get the reputation of being 'little fibbers.' But one must be careful to distinguish wilful lying from mistaking day-dream for fact. Some children in all good faith muddle what they have imagined and what has actually happened, and whilst this tendency must be corrected, heated accusations of lying do far more harm than good here.

Children's day-dreams are frequently compensatory. That means they supply in imagination what actuality denies. The ailing lad day-dreams himself as a great footballer, the plain girl as a beautiful heiress. Few things

tell more of a child's ambitions than his day-dreams, and yet most children are very secretive about them, and only by winning their confidence can one learn what their day-dreams are. Sometimes a child's drawings will suggest them, especially if the teacher asks the child to explain his drawing and refrains from guessing what it may be, since in that case the child often accepts the guess as representing what he really meant. A frequent form of day-dream is to imagine a circle of friends who have the qualities the child wants in his or her friends. Sometimes it is one particular friend who bears a special name. In other cases the friend is represented as naughty, and the child will tell, with exclamations of shocked disapproval, of what the naughty one has done. Yet this generally shows that such misdeeds have a real attraction for the child who indulges them thus in a day-dream.

Day-Dreams and Character

The same applies to the popularity of the villain, or, at least, of the mischievous rascal of stories. The children's corner of many papers consists in tales of semi-human animals who have adventures and play tricks on each other. Children get an imaginary indulgence in this way in things that fascinate and yet are forbidden. It is perhaps for this reason that the ugly golliwog is preferred to the anæmically pretty doll. Any teacher who wants to get within the mind of the children must not regard their day-dreams as childish phantasies merely. There is always a reason for the particular form the day-dream takes, and to study the day-dream will show in what way the child's mind is working its ambitions and faults alike.

I end with a quotation : ' His (the child's) day-dreams about himself prepare him for the presentation of a divine

figure, an image which transcends himself and is yet like him, as a transfigured being is still like the untransfigured being. It presents him with something which he may realize fully because he has already realized it dimly; something whose greatness unites with the littleness of the other, absorbs it, and becomes one with it. But we must not expect from the child the "religious experience" of the man, nor believe that the former will respond to that for which only the latter is prepared' (G. H. Green : *The Daydream*, p. 283).

CHAPTER XII

BELIEF AND UNBELIEF

Belief and Imagination

THE last topic was imagination. Now we talk about belief. What exactly is the difference between the two? It lies in the amount of control exercised by ascertained facts upon our minds. I may imagine myself flying on wings, but I do not believe that I can do anything of the kind. If my purpose were to write a fairy tale I might make use of the notion of men flying on wings, but even there I should have to make some concession to fact, for even the wildest nonsense-story cannot be pure nonsense. It gets its effect by an odd mingling of nonsense and sense. If, on the other hand, my purpose were actual flight, the notion of wings would not serve it, for previous experiments would force me to believe it could not be done by strapping wings to my arms. The popularity of Mars amongst writers of imaginative stories is due to the wide field it offers for unfettered fancy. Stories about this earth are restrained by fact.

All this bears directly upon religious belief. A savage will believe what appears to us fantastic, for he has not that knowledge that restrains belief amongst ourselves. Similarly with little children. It is a mistake to think they are credulous. Often one finds the most determined

little sceptics amongst them. The reason why children believe what grown-ups do not is to be found in the lack of control exercised by knowledge. Education has a very restraining influence upon belief, and upon credulity and superstition, too. But irrational beliefs and superstitions creep through all the entrenched lines of education at times, generally because of emotional factors in the mind. A child starting to learn the facts of life is ready to believe anything. After all, the story of science would appear to us a wild improbability had we not learned what we have. Who would believe that a solid stone was really a whirling mass of electrons?

A Child's Trustfulness

We can see, then, that a child must be ready to believe in wonders, and we need not think it strange that he believes what seems to us fantastic. This ready trustfulness of childhood is sometimes very precious and beautiful, and it is a shame to take advantage of it by telling the little ones rubbish. Belief amounts to tested imagination. Disbelief arises when imagination breaks down under test. A child's imagination can compass any belief, but we need to help it, to satisfy it by giving beliefs that will stand the tests the child is sure to apply later. Once again I repeat that we must never teach what we shall have later to withdraw. The teaching may be symbolic rather than literal if it concerns things the child is not ready to understand, but it must never be false.

Do not teach as literally true any Bible story even unless you yourself believe it so. You can explain how all history, sacred and secular, is liable to contain what we may not be sure are facts. The critics say that King Alfred's cakes, Lady Godiva's ride, and George Washington's cherry

tree all represent stories that have no good authority to attest them. Yet no one disbelieves history on that account. Similarly with other records and stories. We do not want to turn out little prigs and pedants from our schools, but we do want children to have a firm foundation of truth behind their beliefs, a faith based on fact.

Projection

We notice next the relation of belief to will. Professor James wrote: 'We need only in cold blood act as if the thing were real, and keep acting as if it were real, and it will infallibly end by growing into such a connexion with our life that it will become real.' The thought is not a new one. Cæsar's *Gallic War* is not a book to which one would turn for psychology, but he remarked there 'Men readily believe what they wish to believe.' Modern psychoanalysts speak of beliefs as a 'projection' of desires. There is no doubt that the desire to believe or the will to believe can create and sustain belief, especially in minds where the control exercised by education, of which we spoke, is absent, and not only in them, but to some extent in all.

A pathetic instance is the number of people who believe that those reported missing during the war may still be alive. As regards the children we teach, two things may be said in this connexion. First, that their beliefs indicate their desires, and sometimes a child honestly believes what we feel sure he must know to be false, simply because he greatly wishes to do so, and his undisciplined mind has not learnt the responsibility of believing. The second point is that we cannot instil beliefs about spiritual truth when there is no desire for things spiritual. We must make our

children love what is good, love God, before their beliefs about Him can be truly influential in their lives.

Another point is that belief is usually what we act upon. This may not be universally true. There is such a thing as self-deception, and also a few beliefs are purely theoretic. But broadly it is true. If I say that I believe that it is about to rain and sally forth without coat or umbrella, my hearers may well be suspicious of my belief. We get, therefore, as near an infallible test as may be if we ask how far belief determines action. Nothing can more truly show us the vitality of belief. Our children, like ourselves, must show in their lives whether or no they believe.

How Beliefs are Made

A little child in its simplicity believes what he is told. Later, of course, he becomes critical, but none of us ever frames beliefs without reference to three things of great importance. The first is the *social factor*. We all tend to believe what is believed in the circle in which we move. In the Middle Ages everyone believed in witchcraft. Even later, John Wesley did. It was the uncritical acceptance of a belief held by the rest of mankind that made so shrewd an intellect fall into such an error. We to-day believe in ether, but it is quite possible that the science of to-morrow will discard ether as a figment of the imagination. Social sanction bolsters up irrational beliefs still, and our children naturally take their beliefs largely from the beliefs around them. Some of their beliefs militate against every ideal which we wish to teach. We must recollect that.

A second factor is the *emotional factor*. Think of the wild beliefs of victories and retreats, of Russian legions and German spies that the war engendered. It was the

emotions stirred by war that so disturbed our critical power that we were ready to believe all these rumours. The beliefs of man, woman, and child under the stress of emotion are never those which we should entertain in what Bishop Butler called 'cool hour.' Finally, the last factor is *harmony with other beliefs*. None of us is ready to entertain a belief that conflicts with our established beliefs. True, we may ultimately be forced to do so, and to amend our beliefs accordingly. But we shall not do so readily. Yet, after all, in many cases we have the best of reasons for doubting the truth of a claim to truth that contradicts what we know to be true.

Belief and Conversion

A further question upon this matter is often raised : Is it possible for a child not old enough to know what he believes to be converted ? Are not so-called childhood conversions a delusion ?

A distinction should be drawn between decision and conversion. Children incapable of testing their own beliefs, and still in the stage of believing what they are told, are none the less capable of decisions which may be influential during the whole of their lives. The child Hannibal at the age of nine vowed to avenge his country upon the Romans, grew up to be perhaps the greatest military leader who ever lived, and for fifteen years was the soul of the most disastrous war the Romans ever faced. In some Eastern religions young children are initiated into the faith at an early age, and most of them follow through life their childish vows. A child, then, is capable of decision. The question is, under what conditions it should be sought. The main thing is not to treat a childhood decision like an adult conversion. The child should have sufficient know-

ledge of what he is doing, sufficient teaching in the Christian faith, to understand the step before him, before being asked to make a decision. If not he may be entirely justified in repudiating it in later life. In such a case more harm has been done than good. Moreover any decision should be regarded as a beginning and not an end, and followed up by careful teaching until it has become an expression of the character, not a momentary impulse of the will.

CHAPTER XIII

INTELLIGENCE, REASON, AND RATIONALIZING

What is Intelligence ?

WE have been discussing imagination and belief. Our next topic is intelligence. We often talk as if it were a kind of mysterious faculty which was inborn in children, though some have more of it than others. It is true that there are native differences. Some children have a better inborn endowment than others, but the matter does not end there. Darwin tells us that when he left school he was 'a very ordinary boy, rather below the common standard in intellect.' His father warned him he would be a disgrace to himself and his family. He was taken away early, because he was making no progress. He went to Edinburgh and then to Cambridge, and says: 'During the three years which I spent at Cambridge my time was wasted, as far as the academical studies were concerned, as completely as at Edinburgh and at school.' He took an ordinary pass, not an honours degree.

Darwin was fifty when he published *The Origin of Species*. Darwin's intelligence then was slow in ripening, or, at least, in finding its natural outlet; and every teacher who is old enough will tell how some of his 'dull' pupils have surprised and some of his 'clever' ones disappointed him in later life. Intelligence, then, is not the natural growth of inborn power merely. Training has a great deal to do

with its development. What, then, is its chief characteristic? The answer is: The power of analysing wholes and finding their essential relations. We begin with a world of 'things,' and many objects remain merely things to us for life. 'It's some sort of a mineral,' we probably reply, if asked, for example, what is 'tungsten.' Charles Kingsley showed a friend the delicate viscera of a caterpillar under a microscope. The friend, astonished, replied that he thought a caterpillar was just 'skin and squash.' Gradually we learn by attention and discrimination to split up 'things' into their parts. Intelligence is the power of seeing the way to do this according to the purpose before us; it analyses a complex situation and separates the essential and the accidental.

Measuring Minds

Nowadays, in the day-schools, we hear of intelligence tests, of fixing the children's 'intelligence quotients,' and 'mental age.' I confess I was sceptical once about their value; but the fact that the same children take much the same place on the list, when varying types of tests are employed, convinces me that a certain type of intelligence is revealed by the tests. Whether other kinds of intelligence are obscured by them is a moot point. Much, however, can be said for classifying scholars into their classes, not on the ground of age, or by examination, but by some form of intelligence test. We must not forget, however, that some children have latent intelligence that does not appear superficially. An ordinary person under mental stress will sometimes astonish us with a passionate and eloquent plea or a decisive and competent handling of an awkward situation. The reason is that intelligence is not wholly a matter of intellect, but is called out also in

response to instinctive and emotional needs, and often without them intelligence never manifests its best.

In the same way some children there will always be whose best efforts will not be discovered by any mental tests, but may be given in response to some special occasion or opportunity. Another point to recollect is that school training tends to foster and the system to reward the 'all-rounder.' These are the girls and boys who get scholarships most readily, because they get good marks in all papers. Yet another child with a bent for one particular subject may in the long run do better by specializing than the all-rounder. Though such a child is less likely to gain school rewards, the teacher must, above all, beware of underrating the type of intelligence that does not conform to his own.

Most
decidedly
not.

A Child's Reasoning Powers

There are few respects in which adults are more likely to err in regard to children's minds than with regard to reasoning. We reason and we assume children reason as we do. Sometimes even we think animals also do. As an animal has not language, it cannot have thoughts like our thoughts, which are always clothed in words, whether spoken or unspoken, and certainly they do not reason in our sense of the term. A child has language, but still his reasoning methods are not wholly the same as grown-ups. He begins with simple associative thinking, like the Chinese who burnt down the pigsties in order to get roast pork, as Lamb quizzically imagines in the immortal 'Dissertation on Roast Pig.' But, as Lamb says, finally 'a sage arose like our Locke,' who discovered it was not necessary to do this; a piece of flesh put before any fire could be roasted.

This implies reasoning, because it means analysing the

whole situation and picking out certain essentials in it. But what are the essentials? That depends on the point of view, on your practical need. Ask an analyst the essential property of water, and he says hydrogen and oxygen. But if the room is on fire its essential property is that it extinguishes fire; if we are thirsty its essential property is that it quenches thirst, and so on. Now it follows from this that a child does not learn to reason till it learns to have definite ends and to analyse any situation with a view to picking out such features in it as are essential to those ends. But long before a child reasons it has learnt to act and to feel, and it is not to be wondered at that a child will act impulsively first and reason after. It is unwise to blame a child for being unreasonable until he has learnt to be reasonable, and that means until he is old enough to act rationally.

What we have said about the essential properties of an object depending on our own ends ought to show us that such a thing as pure reason does not exist, except in such abstract pursuits as mathematics and the like. Why, for example, do we say that statistics can prove anything? Just because the conclusions we can draw from statistics depend largely on what we want to prove.

An amusing illustration of this occurred in a 'wet' journal, which quoted figures to prove that there was an increase of wife desertion in America, and concluding that, since men could not get away from their wives by going to the 'saloon,' they deserted them. Prohibition, therefore, was to blame. Someone may say that, none the less, facts are stubborn things. Yet in most cases they are what we make them to be. Even if we take a fact as undeniable as that glass is brittle, still the seller probably insists his glass is almost as tough as steel, and the buyer asserts it

as brittle as sealing-wax, whilst both claim what they say to be fact. Equally so in reasoning. We do not reason for amusement, but rather for a practical end, and that end directs our reasoning, and, be it confessed, more or less biases it, too. This brings us within sight of a point of considerable importance, which we must examine next. It is impossible, however, to approach it rightly without doing what we have already done, recognizing the element of will that enters into reasoning. We are apt to imagine that reasoning is calm, impartial, objective. That is an ideal not often attained. Even a judge's summary, which certainly aims at being impartial, does not always succeed in its attempt, much less our own judgements. So we are led on to consider what is called 'rationalization,' which means the finding of reasons to justify actions, a matter of considerable importance in child study.

' Rationalization '

' Rationalization ' is a term applied to the process which induces us to substitute an explanation of actions or beliefs in place of the actual motive. This is not falsehood or conscious hypocrisy. It is either unwittingly done, or is a case of ' None so blind as those who will not see.' All of us at times do this. If we are asked ' Why did you do such and such a thing ? ' we feel it incumbent upon us to reply. Yet sometimes we hardly know, and at other times we cannot bring ourselves to face the facts. All of us know the people who won't be medically examined for sheer fear of what may be found wrong. It is very unreasonable, no doubt, but it is so. Similarly are we often reluctant to probe our own mind, especially near some sore point. Then, without being aware, we ' rationalize.' We don't like to confess that we don't or won't know our own

motives, and so we give one. Here is a man who says he can see nothing in So-and-So's novels, indeed he gives a score of criticisms. Perhaps the novelist on one occasion slighted him. He will not admit to himself that this is the actual cause of his criticism, yet in all probability it is. Instances like this could be multiplied indefinitely. One more example must serve ; this time of an unconscious motive.

A man once confessed he felt he must always count the stairs as he ascended, and said he did so because he ' liked to know.' He could give no other reason. Subsequently it was found that an old woman, locally reputed a witch, had told him in childhood that if he went up thirteen stairs or a multiple of thirteen he would fall down on descending, a fate only to be escaped by jumping from the eleventh to the thirteenth and so making twelve. He had forgotten this, but in his unconscious mind it remained, and he still counted stairs, though apparently he had ceased to step over the twelfth. He had to account for his idiosyncrasy, and rationalized an explanation that was untrue, yet he did not know it was.

Excuse Making

The teacher who does not understand this may easily go astray in interpreting a child's mind. A great deal of what is put down as falsehood is often innocent rationalizing. Sometimes it is harmless as well as innocent, and in such cases there is no need to do anything. Where it is not, there is nothing to be gained by harshness. There is no magic cure for the mind's disorders any more than for those of the body. The remedy is health in both cases, rather than drugs in the one and discipline in the other.

All know the motto : ' Self-knowledge, self-reverence,

self-control.' It is the first of these particularly that counteracts rationalization, and this results from a right system of education, not from the application of special means. One practical point, however, is that the habit of excuse-making should be discouraged. Accept apologies, expect them, but do not lead the children into the habit of excusing themselves unless, of course, there is an unmistakably genuine reason to offer as explanation. The other point is, do not rationalize yourself. If for example you do not feel that such a lesson as some occasionally set from Old Testament battle stories ought to be commended to the children, do not persuade yourself that there are valid reasons why it should be. Most fallacies and superstitions and mistakes that linger on from generation to generation do so because we rationalize some excuses why 'there may be something in it.' Actually we are too lazy to face it out. Truth is not likely to be served by rationalization.

CHAPTER XIV

WILL: OR THE SELF IN ACTION

The Why and Wherefore of Will

WE often say of a child, 'He's got a will of his own.' Of course he has, for will is not an instrument used by the self, it actually *is* the self, the self in action, and as long as we are awake, the self never goes out of action. The fundamental fact about our conscious life is that it is always purposive. Even when we are 'lost in contemplation' it is a very active contemplation, involving a very attentive following of the object. Only in dream life does the will seem to loosen its control, and the chaos that breaks out there, is a good indication of what mental life might be, unless the flow of impressions and impulses were controlled.

All of us are familiar with what happens when two impulses or ideas clash, the silly slips or pointless actions that result, such as 'Spoonerisms' as when hesitating between describing something as an 'instance' or an 'incident,' we call it perhaps an 'incidence.' But not only in such cases does a clash occur. Every impulse tends towards an action, just as every gust of wind tends to drive the fallen leaf before it. The great majority of impulses are, however, checked or 'inhibited' by others, and come to nothing.

Will may be described as the intervention of the self into this conflict of impulses. The self sides with one or

rather with the group to which that one belongs, and turns the scale, for our desires are not isolated. They belong to groups or systems. For example, here is the child hesitating between obedience to the school rules and the impulse to explore 'out of bounds.' The battle is between curiosity and all its attractions on the one side, and discipline and all its penalties on the other: two systems or groups, not two desires. If he deliberately wills, it means that he has weighed up the two sides and chosen. Often, however, and especially with young children and those of the impulsive or erratic type, there is no battle. The attractive impulse sweeps the opposition aside instantly. You may think such a child has an imperfectly trained character, but it is hardly fair to count his acts as deliberately disobedient or wrong.

Explosive and Obstructed Wills

An act of will then represents a blending of impulse and inhibition. According to the prominence of these two respectively in our mental make-up, we get two types of will, which have been called the impulsive or explosive, and the obstructed or restrained. In abnormal cases the two are very strongly contrasted. For example, there are mentally unbalanced folk of bewildering suddenness and others of mulish obstinacy. Most of us, from childhood upward, tend to approximate more nearly to one type or another. Every teacher can pick out at once in the class those who clearly belong chiefly to one type or other. Not only so, but the distinction is found in nations as well as individuals. There are the fickle and hot-blooded races, and the grim and 'dour' folk who look thrice before they leap and think twice before they speak.

The best type of character is that which embraces both,

that can act with decision and decline with firmness. Yet there is a third type, those we call the weak-willed or lack-wills, not because they actually have no will, but because the two aspects of impulse and inhibition are so balanced that they neutralize each other. That is not what is meant by embracing both. Rather is the best type of character one that keeps both in full force, and uses one or other according to the value of the end in view. How to try to develop a child's will on such lines must therefore be the practical application of what has been said about will here.

Wills and Wilfulness

Our next task then is to speak of the development and training of will. First, then, its repression and next its expression. Some writers, particularly psycho-analysts, speak as if repression was a dangerous process. We might, with advantage, distinguish repression or total negation from suppression or partial negation. The latter is a normal process, taking place whenever one impulse is checked by another, and those who did not suppress would have very imperfect wills, indeed they would be mere creatures of impulse. Often, however, the better way is that of sublimation or substitution, especially as regards established habits.

Dr. Chalmers' celebrated phrase 'The expulsive power of a new affection' occurs to one's mind here. Give a child a new interest and it will often break a bad habit far more surely than all the scoldings and punishments. Even, too, if the child himself is honestly trying to get the better of his weakness, a new interest or occupation will often be the soundest ally. A child who had been given a garden and who had worked manfully all day, on saying

his prayers at night remarked naively, 'There isn't anything to forgive to-night, please, God, I've been too busy to be naughty!' I am sorry to append the author's name to the following quotation, though the fact is that his own upbringing, in common with that of many children of his day, was exactly on these lines. 'Break your child's will that it may not perish. Break it as soon as it can speak plainly, or even before it can speak at all. It should be forced to do as it is told, even if you have to whip it ten times running. Break its will in order that its soul may live' (John Wesley). Such advice might be given to a horse breaker, and even there violent methods are a gross mistake. How does Kipling express it?

And some are sulky, while some will plunge
 Some you must gentle, and some you must lunge.
 Some—there are losses in every trade—
 Will break their hearts ere bitted and made,
 Will fight like fiends as the rope cuts hard
 And die dumb-mad in the breaking-yard.

That is the sort of tragedy that happens when a blunderer tries to 'break' a spirited child's will. Spinoza knew better when he said we should make freemen not bondmen of our children. The trained will voluntarily seeks good. The rest are slaves to good habits.

Expressing, not Repressing

A good training teaches the child by making more use of expression than of repression. The explosive will needs gentle breaking, not a violent stopping. The obstructed will should not be forced. Leave the topic in dispute for a time. Let the 'affect,' the emotional mood, cool, and then return quietly to the point. The former type whilst apt when angry to do things they regret after, are usually

sympathetic and affectionate, the latter are reserved, and need to be brought out of themselves; but in both cases the cultivation of sympathy is the best treatment. The former will sympathize readily with the needs and claims of others once their imagination is touched. The latter need to be brought to do this.

All wills are alike in this that, other things equal, they tend to act on the same lines as they have previously acted upon. Hence the importance of precedents.

CHAPTER XV

INDIVIDUALITY, SELFHOOD, AND PERSONALITY

The Ingredients of Self

WE have described the will as the self in action, but what is the self? Is individuality the same as selfhood and selfhood the same personality? We use all three terms rather loosely, and it might be well to separate them and say we are born distinct individuals, we grow into selfhood, and personality is something we more or less attain.

What then is the self? For a little child at the outset the self is the body. We still retain this usage when we say, 'I hurt myself.' With some people clothes are almost a part of themselves. They feel differently and act differently according to their dress, the uniform, the working clothes, the old coat or Sunday best. Similarly other property may affect our sense of selfhood. An injury to a child's pet or toy is almost as bad as an injury to that child personally. Our family, too, comes into the bond of selfhood. What happens to them seems in a true sense a happening to ourselves. We might call all these aspects of our personal self.

Then there is our social self. It is difficult for any of us to be uninfluenced by what others may think of us. 'Give a dog a bad name and hang him.' Let a child think that

others reckon him naughty and he is likely to act the part. Many a child has been made conceited by hearing undue eulogy—a little is generally good—and so forth. Beside this, there is the mental or spiritual self, our inner life and thought. This tangle of relationships, all included in selfhood, shows how it is that 'I' and 'myself' are not identical. 'I' can question, dislike, laugh at 'myself.' We can distinguish them in time, 'I am not what I was,' 'I will be what I am not,' and so on. In deliberation or temptation we range one self, against another. In a sense all can say, 'My name is legion, for we are many.'

Self and Other Selves

The greatest factor in making selfhood is other selves. Without them we could hardly be selves ourselves. Each self develops by imitation of others, and exchange of thought with them. We have but to realize how many of our thoughts are coloured by our times. It would have been impossible for Shakespeare to have thought as we think to-day, and the ways of the twentieth century will appear obsolete and quaint in the next. We are what we are because of what we have got from others.

Moreover a self apart could hardly know itself. We talk of adaptation to environment. For us humans that means social environment chiefly. To know what others will do means to know what we should do and we are at once adaptable to a familiar environment and much less so to a strange one. To know one's self is thus to know others. To know others is to know one's self. 'Judge not,' said the Master, 'that ye be not judged.' By whom? Often by our own judgement, for in judging another's

motives we often reveal our own, or what our own would be in a similar case.

Personality

We said that we were born individuals, and that this individuality came, as we grew, to express itself in selfhood. An animal even, particularly the higher ones, can have something that could fairly be called selfhood, but not personality. Indeed, some men seem scarcely able to attain personality, like those who, Dante says, lived and never were alive. Starting from the basis of individuality and selfhood, personality is a growth, and, even so, not an automatic growth. It is an attainment.

To follow the process of personality in the making we must start from the beginning. The first thing is the activity or 'conativeness' of the child. That is not something that is learnt. It is given. No one need teach a child to move, look round, take interest, try to do certain things—the impulse to do these is inborn. 'Why can't you sit still?' asks the unreasonable grown-up. He might as well ask the lambs why they cannot stop skipping. God made children so that they cannot sit still. They were meant to move, to be active, for so they must grow and learn. If they did not they would never be even teachable. This activity, of course, will not be undirected. The child does not consciously direct it, but just as each animal develops according to its species, and is modified more or less by its surroundings, so will it be with the activities of the growing child. These factors we must accept and make the best use of. What is no less important and inevitable is the tendency to seek conscious ends or ideals definitely. It is our ideals more than anything else that make our personality.

The materials of personality are provided by Nature and arranged by nurture, but nurture is not able to mould the materials as a potter the clay. Sometimes they are too intractable. Plato, in the Republic, recognized these two factors, but he seemed to think, as many another idealist has thought, that a good training could produce a good character. If it only were so! Still, let us look at what Nature provides first. This includes the common heritage of instinct, of which we spoke earlier. It also includes the natural endowment of each individual, for we are not all born alike. Prof. Lloyd Morgan tells of five pups, taken for a walk. They came across a five-barred gate with the bars set narrow below, and wider higher up. The dogs tried to get through at the bottom, and, failing, struggled until three in turn discovered the higher bars were passable and got through. The fourth 'doggedly' struggled below, the fifth lay down and whined. The experiment was repeated for some twenty minutes, with the same result each time. They were born with different endowments. Just so with children. Some find their way through difficulties, some doggedly plod round and round them, never solving them, and never giving up. Others cease trying.

Natural Endowment

Under the factor of natural endowment we may include disposition, temper, and temperament. Prof. McDougall divides the spheres of the three by making disposition the sum total of the instinctive tendencies, some of which are often more strongly marked in one individual than others. To temper he allots such non-instinctive qualities as patience, hopefulness, impulsiveness, fickleness. To temperament the influence of the glands of which we hear so

much nowadays and know so little. I do not suggest that these distinctions afford the recognized usage of the terms in question. I mention them because it is needful that however we distinguish disposition, temper, and temperament, we should recognize these influences.

Now let us say a word about nurture. These given materials are changed and developed by use, blended with the experience we acquire. We do not learn to live, we learn by living. The child will naturally learn something. It is the teacher's art and part to co-ordinate his natural impulses and activities, if need be, to 'sublimate' some of them, and to shape them to useful purposes. Mere repression is a very small part. The great practical lesson for the teacher is that a child's personality can never be hurried into growth. We must never forget that immaturity is not imperfection. Every link is complete in itself, even if the whole chain is not yet forged, and each stage of the child's growth is a complete thing and a necessary one. He must pass through it, and as he does so, there is something to put into it and get out from it. Children are not undeveloped adults, and must not be judged from the standpoint of an adult's personality. It is much better to be a child than a 'little man' or 'little woman.' The personality of some children never develops because they have been made old before they had learnt what it was to be young. The Maker never meant that. The best result at the end is almost surely that which came by the best use of each successive stage of the child's growth.

The Process and the Product

We have spoken of the process of attaining personality.

Now let us see something of the product. Personality is no fixed and unchangeable thing. Most children show the first marks of the personalities they will be quite early, and yet no one can say how far the childish manifestation will be that of manhood also. Yet some identity remains through all change, some permanence in all its progress. Our personality may cease to be 'this,' and become 'that,' and the change may be cataclysmic. Yet in one sense we are still the 'same.' In what sense, then? Take the story of the silk stockings that were darned bit by bit with worsted until they were all worsted. Were they the 'same' stockings at the end as at the beginning, and if not, when did they cease to be the 'same'? I do not propose to discuss so paralysing a conundrum, but if the stockings had darned themselves, or chosen to be gradually transformed into worsted, they would have been the same in an intelligible sense from first to last. So, then, with the normal changes of personality. Personality is a process rather than a persistence, and 'it does not yet appear what we shall be,' but there is an underlying unity of personality that keeps it in one sense the same throughout. That unity is part bodily perhaps, but still more mental, and the more complex and many-sided the personality, the more striking is the unity that pervades it.

Character may be called the expression of personality. If it were asked what is the precise difference between character and personality, one might reply by asking what is the difference between sunlight and sun, between colour and light. Our character is the total of our sentiments and tendencies. If our wills are consistent and persistent the character is strong. If the ends they thus seek are good, the character is good. Evil characters are often

strong characters, for the will is that which makes the force of character rather than the sentiments behind or the ends ahead. Yet mere strong will does not make strong character. It is the organized and systematic will that counts. Strong wills may issue in nothing more than futile bluster and impotent passion. It takes a stronger character to work out one's plans under limitations and difficulties than to be an autocrat imposing one's will. The truly strong character knows when to yield and what to yield. It does not exalt prejudices into principles, and does not battle for details as for essentials. In give and take, it knows what to give and what to take.

Before and Behind Character

Before and behind character lie two undefined grounds. The one is inborn, the racial inheritance. The other is ahead, the undeveloped possibilities. Bernard Bosanquet used to speak of our finite-infinite selves. Browning sings of 'All I could never be.' We need to add 'All I may be.' It was of this that F. W. H. Myers spoke when he said that our higher personality vastly transcended the limits of the body.

Lastly, conduct is the expression of character. It is true that we may act 'contrary to our character,' but this means to our habitual character, for any deliberately willed action is a manifestation of some aspect of our character. We must remember that children do not start with a blank sheet upon which they proceed to draw the outlines of a character. They start in bondage to impulse and instinct, just as animals do, and unless they learn to master those powers, their conduct will not be the expression of a rational and developed character, but merely a blend of

instinct and experience, like that of a well-trained animal. As Mazzini said : ' We are not free, but are free to become free.' The aim of mental and moral education is to help them to become free.

Types of Character

A further question must now be considered. How far must the teacher be influenced in dealing with children by what is supposed to be their particular type? One frequently hears nowadays of various types of character. Dr. Jung speaks of 'extroverts' and 'introverts' for example, characters, that is to say, which turn outwards and inwards respectively. Broadly speaking, the friendly type of child, fond of sport, emotional on the surface, keen and not easily abashed, is an extrovert. On the other hand, the sensitive child of retiring disposition, thoughtful, inclined to be mystical, reticent concerning his feelings and diffident about himself is the introvert. We should remember that this kind of classification is never more than approximate. We have a sort of stock type in our mind of the average Frenchman, German or Yankee, but acquaintance with those races soon shows us how silly it would be to expect to find our type embodied in all we meet of them. Similarly here. We never find a pure extrovert or a pure introvert, but just as we realize that, after all, the average Frenchman and the average Yankee are easily distinguishable, though neither may be exactly like the traditional type, so we shall find among the children we teach types of character more extrovert than introvert and so on. There is nothing new in the notion of types of character. The terms choleric, phlegmatic, sanguine, melancholy, for

INDIVIDUALITY, SELFHOOD, PERSONALITY 111

example, were applied by the Greeks to denote the effect of the 'humours' of the body upon the temperament. The interest, and such value as may be in these classifications, is that in them we can study temperaments in the abstract, and in the light of that understand better the very mixed types of temperament we shall meet among the children we deal with.

The point to bear in mind here is what has been already said, namely, that behind personality lies individuality, and that individualities may roughly be grouped into types or classes. But just because they are rightly called individualities, they never fall completely into one class or type. I have known a typical dock labourer whose chief interests in life appeared to be beer and betting, say in a moment of confidence that he often repeated to himself Whittier's lovely lines, 'O Sabbath rest by Galilee.' That sort of thing does not happen in books, it happens only in life. But it does happen, and it is just those extraordinary break-aways from what we conventionally expect that make us add 'perhaps' to the neatest psychological classification.

Physical and Social Environment

Moreover, all classification according to inborn temperament is liable to be modified by external influences, sometimes very considerably. There are two factors which always modify the development of every personality. They are the physical and the social surroundings. We often repeat the lines that remind us that stone walls do not a prison make or iron bars a cage, for the physical environment need not mould us to its surroundings. I have known country lads without the slightest interest in natural

history, whilst one of the keenest little naturalists I ever met was a lad in a Lancashire cotton town, who had never been outside its area, except on a trip to Blackpool. Yet he had gleaned from books and the local museum a far better knowledge of natural history than any lad of his age I have ever known. It shows us how little the physical surroundings need determine the interests. I do not say, however, that they do not do so. They are almost sure in some ways in the normal case to react on character through habits, and in estimating the influences that go towards moulding personality. We must not overlook this factor.

The social surroundings are much more important, however. Take, for example, a man like the African chief Khama. His ancestors were crafty, cruel, superstitious, native witch-doctors. Khama was a Christian gentleman, a 'black man with a white heart.' Khama broke with the old social inheritance by the power of a new, and the most hopeful fact for the future of humanity is that such vast and speedy transformations are possible. The physical inheritance is fixed. The Ethiopian cannot change his skin. The mental inheritance is free, and so far from the child being obliged to repeat the mental outlook of his ancestry, he can have, by the power of new social surroundings, a new mentality in a single generation.

I will sum up from the teacher's point of view by saying that there are three types of teaching that never help a child to the attainment of its own personality. First, premature teaching, which makes little prigs, children over-old for their years. Next 'spoon-fed' teaching, which kills initiative, and last wholesale teaching, which crams every child into the same mill, and ignores individual differences. The type of teaching best calculated to develop

INDIVIDUALITY, SELFHOOD, PERSONALITY 113

personality begins at the earliest stage by a training in obedience; next comes co-operation, when the child learns fellowship with the parent or teacher; and finally self-determination, when discretion and discipline have been learnt, and the teacher stands aside to watch and perhaps to pray, for his work is now complete.

CHAPTER XVI

JESUS AS A TEACHER

(1) HIS PSYCHOLOGY

A STUDY of the method of Jesus as a teacher is interesting in itself, but still more is it a wonderful example of the teacher's art. First of all a word or two about the psychological background of the teaching. Jesus was the greatest of psychologists, for 'He knew what was in man.' He had a profound, unparalleled, practical knowledge of the human mind. Yet we need not assume that this was just given to Him because He was divine. He was also perfect man, and by looking within, or as psychology calls it, 'introspection,' He knew the depths and capacities of manhood. We, who are all of us less mentally and morally than we might be, do not know the mind's powers as Jesus knew them.

But Jesus also equipped Himself to teach. His education would be that of the Jewish lad of his class, the 'three Rs,' and the Bible of His race, our Old Testament, together with some of the comments and expositions his teachers would attach to it. We have said that education does not consist in learning, but in learning to live, and thus Jesus, despite the scanty schooling He would receive, was educated in the truest sense. We cannot doubt that He observed

keenly. In the delightful chapter on the boyhood of Jesus, Dr. Glover, in *The Jesus of History*, has given us a picture of how the boy Jesus would see, and use what He saw.

The Gospels hint that this habit remained. They often say Jesus 'looked,' 'perceived,' 'saw.' It is a picture of a man with eyes wide open who saw life sanely and as a whole, in a wonderful proportion. Witness that charming little parable about the children in the market-place, playing weddings and funerals, think how Jesus watched their play, and used the story of the discontented child who would not play either game, as a lesson to the grown up folk who would not have John or Himself. Notice, too, that Jesus had a much more 'human' view of things than John. The Baptist had the force and the limitations of the ascetic. He was:

A phantom among men, companionless
As the last cloud of the expiring storm,
Whose thunder is its knell.

Jesus 'came eating and drinking,' sharing the people's home life. Who would have invited John to a wedding? To John sin was simply hideous. Jesus knew that, but He realized that to men it appeared with a glamour and fascination. He knew life as John had never seen it in his lonely wilderness. This, then, is how the greatest of teachers gathered His materials. We who are teachers must go to life just as much as to books. The teacher who would teach like Jesus must know, as Jesus knew, the habits, interests, ways of thinking and living that his pupils have. He must not only know them, he must be interested in them. To teach others your standpoint you must first gain theirs.

(2) HIS METHOD

(A) His Use of Interest

First notice the use made by Jesus of interest. In the East an illustration appeals more than the aptest argument. Jesus, like other teachers of His day, taught in parables. But so far as we have any record, his contemporaries used allegory more than parable, and their illustrations were apt to be fanciful and artificial, sometimes they appear to us quibbling. The stories Jesus told could not have been learned from His teachers, for He taught by quite different means. His stories are simple, natural, straightforward, with a wonderfully wide general interest. There is no tedious repetition, no Eastern flavouring that makes Western taste critical. Some of the stories of the Buddhist or Hindu sacred books seem trivial or fantastic, and of little interest to Western readers. The stories of Jesus are immortal, and appeal to-day to people of all races and culture, even as they appealed to Galilean peasants two thousand years ago. There are no others, not even the *Illiad* or *Odyssey*, of which this is so true.

Not only did Jesus find stories of general interest, He also managed to meet the particular interests of his audiences. Those interests were rather narrow. They comprised work, i.e. farming and fishing, and domestic and social life. Practically the whole of Jesus's illustrations fall within these spheres. Yet they are the great elemental interests of all men and women, and the wonderful art of Jesus as a teacher found something that appealed to the unlettered countrymen of that little Syrian province, and to everyone else. Perhaps because He thought rather of their experiences than His own, He said little or nothing

that can be called personal; for example, He uses no metaphor from carpentry, unless 'Take My yoke upon you' be one, and the yoke after all connects more with the farmer who uses it than the craftsman who made it. He does not travel outside to take illustrations from wider spheres. They would not have appealed in the same way. He knew that homely stories get home.

Expositors sometimes find all sorts of subtle shades of meaning distinguishing the different parables. We are told that the sheep was lost outside, the coin inside. The coin did not know it was lost, the sheep perhaps was only vaguely miserable because it missed the flock, the prodigal son knew what he had done, and so on. Now great literature always has a depth of meaning that the surface does not show. But one feels that the immediate purpose of Jesus's parables was not to hint at all these subtleties. When He definitely explained the parable of the sower, He gave one straightforward meaning to each point in it, and no more. In the three parables mentioned just now, despite minor differences, the message is the same throughout. That of the lost sheep touched men's interests, that of the coin lost from the bangle touched women's interest, that of the lost son touched both for it appeals to the parents' interest. Each reinforces the other and all three tell primarily of the joy that comes when the lost is found.

(B) His Use of Repetition

A good teacher is never afraid of repeating what he has said. Repetition may be inartistic, but it is sound teaching method. Yet it need not be bare repetition. The psychology of memory-training lays stress on multiplying associations. As we said before if we want our tent to

stay firm when the wind blows, we peg it down well with many cords. Just so, a thought which has only one association is soon blown out of the mind. The good teacher multiplies associations, and so binds that which he wants to hold firm by many ties. We notice how frequently Jesus used this method. He reinforced what He said by different illustrations and expressions, all leading back to the same root-thought. 'Again, the Kingdom of Heaven is like'—words familiar to us all in the New Testament. The best addresses often consist really of one master thought. That is placed in the middle of the circle of teaching, and every radius leads back to it. The same radius is not traversed twice, but as the teacher goes round the circle that joins the end of the radii, each radius affords a path of association back to the centre. Of course, the central thought must be one worth emphasis. If it is, and if it is thus riveted in the mind, it will be long before it is effaced. Jesus never taught so as to dazzle His hearers with the brilliance of His words. He had always the practical task of getting home an idea, and He did not fail.

Not only did Jesus repeat the leading truths He taught : He also secured that they should repeat themselves. We might call it almost an 'automatic' process. Had He given far-off stories of strange new things in distant realms, no doubt His hearers would have listened ; but as the stories would have had no associations with their lives, most of them, back again in the daily routine, would have forgotten all about what they had heard. Jesus chose stories which daily life would certainly recall. A man hears Him speak of sorting the catch, sowing the seed, looking for the lost sheep, and listens, perhaps idly, and goes away. During the week he sees a fisherman sorting

out the good from the bad ; notices the birds following the sower ; meets a friend who asks if he has seen his lost sheep. At once memory brings back to his mind, by the association of ideas, what he heard the other day, and he gets a fresh reminder. ' Just what the Rabbi said,' he thinks, although he does not realize the art of the Teacher who taught so that His hearers would certainly get from daily life a reminder of what He had told them. However clever a lesson may be, however interesting, it soon goes. We do not remember many even of the good sermons, much less the ordinary ones. But what enters our daily life and makes an association there lasts far longer. The Greatest of Teachers knew that, and acted upon it.

(C) His Use of Curiosity

It is a mistake to say to any child ' Don't be curious.' That suggests curiosity is a fault. It is not. It is an instinct, and no instinct is wrong or without its proper place. We may say ' Don't be curious about this,' but it is foolish to forbid all curiosity. The incurious child would be the most hopeless little dullard. The teacher's best asset is the child's curiosity, and the Greatest Teacher made no little use of curiosity. We often meet with paradoxes, piquant challenging statements in His teaching. We murmur something about the eastern style and miss the point.

' If a man,' said Jesus, ' makes you go with him for a mile, go two.' The Jew was sometimes commandeered for military purposes. Perhaps he had to act as a sort of Army Service Corps, or lend his ox or ass for transport. That the foreign conqueror exacted the service made it doubly hateful. Sullenly he marched off, and as sullenly

took himself away when the requisitioned service was over. Jesus said, Offer to do a little more. His hearers would be provoked, but perhaps they were also provoked to think, and that is what the Teacher wanted. The hearer generally discounts liberally what he hears. Jesus added something to counteract this by strong challenging statements.

Does this mean exaggeration? No. Jesus said, 'Give to him that asketh thee,' and we say it is impossible. Yet in the same teaching He said, 'Give not that which is holy to the dogs.' It is certainly impossible both to give and not to give, and this brings us to a second point. Jesus did not make His deeper meaning obvious. These strong challenging statements are not exaggerated, but deliberately they are not intended to be taken superficially. The 'give' and 'give not' prove that. A man has to sit down and think it out, and if he does so he will see that he is not told to give what is asked, not even to give any definite thing, but simply to give. It is the spirit of giving Jesus emphasized, because He knew that most lives are set on getting rather than giving. Other teachers said 'get the best.' Jesus taught us to give the best. You cannot give what you have not got, but to give the best is the only way to keep it. Jesus made people think, because until a man thinks, he may be told what is true, but he never owns truth. Moreover, Jesus knew that men soon tire of obvious truths. So He put more than a surface meaning into His words, and hinted 'He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.' 'Seeing, they may see and not understand.' The thoughtful listener began to wonder. Plato said philosophy begins in wonder. Jesus thought the same about the Kingdom of God. One of the traditional sayings attributed to Him may well be true: 'Let not him who

seeks cease till he find, when he finds he shall be astonished, and astonished he shall reach the kingdom.'

(D) His Use of Simplicity

The few words given to us in the New Testament from the original show that Jesus employed the people's language when He spoke to them. This was not the classical Hebrew in which the Old Testament is written, but a dialect of Hebrew called Aramaic. Strange it is to think that the eternal words were spoken in the dialect of a small Syrian province! In the synagogue Jesus read aloud, of course, from the Hebrew. But to the people He spoke in their own tongue, and the common people heard Him gladly. No doubt Jesus deliberately chose to speak so because as the great master of the teacher's art, He knew well the value of simplicity. The first thing, though not the greatest in teaching, is to be interesting. To speak with the tongue of men and of angels, and to be uninteresting will profit nothing, neither to your hearers nor to you. No one can be interesting who is not understood, and no one can be understood who is not simple. The teacher must never forget that he is travelling over a familiar road and knows what is coming. The pupil does not, therefore he must always put his thoughts into words simpler than those that are sufficient for himself. Few teachers realize that enough. Jesus never failed to speak so that the simplest could understand a meaning, and yet those same words have not been fully fathomed by twenty centuries. Transparent as crystal though they seem, our plummets have not yet touched bottom. It is exceedingly hard to be simple without being shallow. • Only a master of his subject can really succeed in being simple and sufficient.

Some are simple, but never take you beyond the fringe. Others obtain simplicity by picturesque inaccuracy. Only a master mind can be simple and deep, and not all master minds can express themselves in this way, though there is always a certain simplicity in genuine scholars. 'In meekness of wisdom' are they known. Perhaps the reason is that truth is simple. The difficulties are all in attaining truth. When it is solved, the most perplexing problem becomes simplicity itself. The more thoroughly, then, the teacher has penetrated into his subject, the simpler is it to him, and while the pupil may still find it hard to follow the steps that lead to the truth, he will catch some glimpse of that truth in his teacher's vision. Jesus put the truth in such a way that the ignorant could follow. They may have thought they had got it all. What actually happened was that they had got all they could. No teacher can give more than that, but some fail to do as much. Those who sit in the school of Jesus find themselves surprised again and again at the inexhaustible character of His simplest words. As they progress as His pupils they find they can get more and yet more, and even so, the words have fresh stores of meaning. That is the perfection of the teacher's art, to give so that each range of intelligence before him can get a message from the same teaching, and no teacher who ever lived has succeeded in doing this so fully as Jesus.

(E) His Use of Positiveness

The last point to notice in our study of the method of Jesus's teaching is what we may call its positiveness. We notice first of all that Jesus seldom said 'Do not,' and when He did, almost always it was preparatory to saying what should be done. For example, He said how men should

not pray, give alms, or fast, but He added at once the right way of doing these things. The mere negative He hardly ever used. Again, He told men what they could do in preference to what they could not. Only once did He speak of a thing that could not be done, and that was the sheer impossibility of serving God and Mammon. This feature of His method is based on the sounder foundation. Human nature is essentially 'conative,' that is to say, designed for action. Mere prohibitions, or, to use the psychological word, 'inhibitions,' are simply so many barriers across the stream. A barrier may be needful, but a way has to be found for the outflow. A mere system of taboos is a futile method of training any creature. Recollect that a child must do something. Hence to forbid deceit, to blame selfishness, to condemn anger is a much poorer method than to praise truthfulness, unselfishness, good temper. Children are born imitative, and are naturally hero-worshippers. Their need is the good example, the right type of hero, not a string of negative precepts. Moreover, there is the important point of suggestion to bear in mind. John the Baptist teaching the people gave good advice and some pertinent criticism. Yet Jesus, instead of blaming the very blameworthy publicans and sinners who came to Him, 'spoke to them of the Kingdom of God.' He filled their imagination with a picture of the loveliness of goodness, and left it to work its effect by suggestion. It was the better way. Negative teaching is much more liable to be upset than is positive teaching by 'the law of reversed effort.' This means that in some things the harder we try the worse we succeed. Think of trying to go to sleep, and you will realize its truth. The young batsman trying to recollect all that he must and must not do is soon bowled. The batsman who is quietly

confident plays easily. So with moral struggles. Do not speak continually of the hazards of the fight. Speak rather of the power of God to keep us. That was the method of Jesus's teaching. This, too, brings us to another side of its positiveness. He taught with authority. The best teachers are not dogmatic. They do not refuse to look at any other view than their own, but they always are authoritative. They speak as those who know, and nothing weighs more with the pupils than the quiet assurance of the teacher. Children are influenced unwittingly by suggestion, and the undecided teacher communicates, without knowing it, the sense of his own indecision, which leaves, instead of a sharp outline, a blurred impression in the hearer's mind. Use authority like Jesus, but base it, as He did, on reason and conscience.

(3) HIS MANNER OF APPROACH

In this study of Jesus as a teacher we have noticed the materials and methods Jesus employed. We have now to say something of the manner in which He approached His hearers. Some of the best men have stultified their efforts by an unhappy manner of dealing with people. The charm of Jesus's teaching was doubled by the charm of His manner of approaching His hearers. First of all, He had a message for each as well as for all. Queen Victoria complained that Mr. Gladstone addressed her like a public meeting. Some speakers can deal with a crowd, but cannot adapt their message to individuals. Jesus could capture the attention of great multitudes, and yet could speak to individuals like Nicodemus or the Woman of Samaria in a way that went home to their hearts. Part of the art of

a teacher is to embrace the individual's need in speaking to the class. It is a mistake to 'preach at' an individual in the company of others. A hint or reproof can be given apart, and probably will not be resented. The same thing given in public will be received amiss. The teacher will find it always better to encourage in public, and never to blame—until, at least, he has tried the effect of a word apart. Next we notice that Jesus was sympathetic. He knew His subject—human nature. We are apt to forget that. We think that the day-school teacher teaches arithmetic, geography, and so forth; the Sunday-school teacher a Scripture lesson. It is more important to remember that both teach girls and boys. The subject is always the pupil first of all. We are educating lives, not instilling knowledge. Know your subject sympathetically. St. Paul says that when he became a man he put away childish things. One hopes the Apostle put them away on an accessible shelf, so that he could reach them down whenever he met a child. No one can hope to be a good teacher who has forgotten the standpoint of the pupil. The modern child has interests in things unknown in our childhood, but this does not alter the fact that the spirit of childhood is unchanged in all ages. Lastly, Jesus was fearless. This applies especially to teachers of senior classes. They have to answer awkward and controversial questions, and it is essential that their scholars should not get the suspicion that the teacher is hesitating or 'hedging.' Jesus had to face similar questions, and He had an invariable way of settling them. 'What is God's point of view?' was His attitude. He did not stop to consider whether the answer was orthodox, popular, or safe. Yet He had no desire merely to startle or upset His hearers. He simply took the question up from God's standpoint.

Recollect, for example, how He solved the question of divorce and of the tribute money. The teacher who knows his own mind is always more attractive than the one who knows what it is usual to say. But mere originality does not feed—it stimulates; and whilst stimulation is good, man does not live by mustard alone. The teacher who speaks out sincerely what he thinks to be God's mind will never fail to influence, and, even where he cannot exercise a decisive influence, he will not have taught in vain.

(4) CHRIST AND CHILDHOOD

It remains only to say something regarding Jesus's attitude towards childhood. The Rabbis regarded children as immature adults. Jesus's psychology was very different in its conception of childhood. Instead of teaching that children must receive the Kingdom of Heaven like men, He taught that men must receive the Kingdom like children. The child was not the immature man. In spiritual matters the man must be as the child. Theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven. That the Kingdom belongs to children as a birthright is what Jesus taught. Men have taught that they receive it by baptism or conversion. Such rites may be akin to the coronation of one born a king. He is king before he is crowned. The kingdom is his from his birth. What Jesus said of the child's right to the Kingdom was in keeping with the ideas of those who heard Him. Every Jewish child was born an heir of the covenant of Abraham. Circumcision was only a sign that the boy was a member of the covenant race. No analogous rite existed for girls, but they were 'daughters of Abraham' by right of birth. The child—so Jesus taught us—then, is to be trained so that he can use rightly what is his—

namely, the Kingdom. If he strays away from the Kingdom, bring him back, but recollect that his it is by right.

The old doctrine of total depravity, as it used to be presented, obscured this. It is rather strange to find that its unfavourable estimate of human nature is repeated to-day by those psycho-analysts who say, with Dr. Ernest Jones, that young children are selfish, egoistic, dirty, immodest, and cruel. It is not just sentiment that repudiates such a statement. It is simply untrue. Children are not angels, but there is no need to paint such a picture as this even of the least lovable child. It is striking to notice the word used in the New Testament in the passage which speaks of Jesus 'blessing' them. It means, literally, spoke well of them—the word from which we derive our word 'eulogize.' Jesus eulogized childhood, and He knew. The civilized world to-day recognizes the rights of childhood. We are doing something in welfare clinics and in similar ways to stop the terrible mortality amongst young children. The Sunday-school teacher is doing a similar work to check the spiritual mortality, fighting against the foes of the soul as the health workers fight against the foes of the body. Christ's hardest word was spoken against those who made His little ones to stumble. May we not infer that His greatest praise will be given to those who cause them to walk aright? The Sunday-school teacher is to be congratulated. The highest blessing the Master has to give is on the work that he does.

